Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/obligationsancti0000unse

78260

THE OBLIGATION AND SANCTIFICATION

OF THE

CHRISTIAN SABBATH,

CONSIDERED IN

TWO SERMONS,

PREACHED IN THE WESLEYAN METHODIST CHAPEL, LOWER ABBEY STREET, ON NOV. 26, AND DEC. 24, 1837.

BY

DR. JOHN B. BENNETT.

The Lord's day is so precious in the eyes of every right-minded Christian, and its proper observance of such manifold utility, that it cannot, I trust, be regarded as labour misapplied, to adduce such considerations as may tend to promote this observance.

ARCHBISHOP WHATELY.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY THOMAS I. WHITE,

65, FLEET STREET.

MDCCCXXXVIII.

BX
8472
B4

PREFACE.

The Sermons, of which the following is the substance, were undertaken in the ordinary course of ministerial duty, without any intention of laying them before the public in their present form. They are now published in compliance with the desire of persons to whose judgment the writer feels he ought to defer. The subject, always of deep importance, has in our day become invested with peculiar interest. If there be here presented a compendious view of its principal topics, fitted in some degree to meet the circumstances of those who cannot procure, or have not leisure to study larger works, and calculated, by the Divine blessing, to excite any to augmented effort to promote the observance of the Lord's day in their country, in their houses, and in their hearts, the utmost wish of the writer will be gratified, and his earnest prayer graciously answered.

SERMON I.

THE PERPETUAL OBLIGATION OF THE SABBATH.

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy."—Exodus xx. 8.

In these words, which were originally spoken by Jehovah himself, amidst the awful solemnities that accompanied the promulgation of the law on Sinai, we have the Sabbatical institution brought before us, in the fulness of its authority and obligation; and are directed to keep in remembrance the historical record of its establishment and enforcement, in order that we may be able, in this as in other instances, to give a reason of the faith that is in us, and also that our knowledge of the Divine will may be, as it ought always to be, operative, leading us to keep holy that day which God, for his own glory and for our welfare, has set apart as a day of rest from worldly labours, and of special consecration to himself—with the proper observance of which he has connected so many blessings, and against the violations of which he has denounced so many threatenings. Occupying, as the Sabbath does, a prominent place in the inspired record, freighted as it is with good of the most precious and enduring nature, enshrined, as it has long been, in the hearts of believers, as identified with the seasons of their most elevated religious enjoyments, it is a matter of deep regret that any amongst those who profess to take the word of God as the rule of their faith and conduct, should be found either practically disregarding the Lord's Sab-

bath, " doing their own ways, finding their own pleasures, and speaking their own words," or theoretically disowning its authority, and in so far making common cause with the antinomian and the infidel. The existence of so much unscriptural opinion and so much unscriptural practice on this subject, makes it important that we should be well acquainted with what the sacred volume testifies respecting it; and it is my present object to bring before you some considerations intended to prove the perpetual and universal obligation of the Sabbath, and to enforce its due observance and sanctification. As this is a field of great extent, I shall enter upon it without farther prefatory observation than to premise, that I do not expect to advance much that will be new to those who are acquainted with the controversy on these points. So repeatedly and ingeniously have they been argued, that perhaps little original remains to be adduced; and it shall be my effort not to pursue less cogent arguments, because they are clad in the attractive garb of novelty, but rather to select, from the solid reasonings which have been frequently urged, such as best suit our present purpose. May the Spirit of Truth enlighten our understandings, and powerfully apply the truth to our hearts.

We infer that the obligation to observe the Sabbath is permanent and universal, when we, in the first place, "remember" its *original institution.* Of this the record is given, Gen. ii. 1—3 : " Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made ; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made ; and God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work, which God created and made." The Sabbath then was instituted on the first day after the work of creation was completed. After six days' labour God rested and was refreshed. It is manifest, however, that these expressions are not to be

understood as literally meaning repose after fatigue, or the renewal of exhausted vigour, for "the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary;" but are used in condescension to man, and with reference to the order that God designed to establish. He who said, "Let there be light, and there was light," had only to "speak, and it should be done; to command, and it should stand fast;" he could, in a moment, have caused the world to spring into being, and all its inhabitants to throng their appointed spheres of existence. Between God's eternity and the divisions of time, there cannot be any relation. But the work of creation is described as having extended over six revolutions of time, while on the seventh revolution there was a cessation from it, in order to mark to us how much time should be for labour, and how much for rest; as Lightfoot observes, 'What needed God to take six days for what he could have done in a moment, but that he, by his own proceeding and acting, would set the clock of time, and measure out days and a week, six days for labour, the seventh for rest, six for man, the seventh for God.' This seventh day the Creator appointed as the Sabbath, blessing it to man, while he set it apart, consecrated, sanctified it to himself. It would be difficult to conceive a statement more direct and unequivocal than that given by Moses, and a plain reader of the Scriptures, on hearing, for the first time, that certain theologians regard the Sabbath as *not* having been instituted at the creation, but two thousand five hundred years after, when the Israelites were in the wilderness, would feel a very natural curiosity to know how they explain away such a passage as this. Now it is thus, (and let it be marked as a specimen of the kind of reasoning by which it is attempted to overturn the obligation of the Lord's Sabbath)—they say, that as the historian was himself an Israelite, living after the period at which (according to their view) the Sabbath was instituted in the wilderness,

he introduced a notice of it in the history of the event which it was to commemorate, 'in the order of connexion not of time;' and thus, when telling of the creation of the world, by prolepsis or anticipation, mentions the Sabbath, although it was not actually appointed for many ages after the period of which he was then writing. Without dwelling on the gratuitous character of the assumption here made, that the book of Genesis was not written until after the giving of the law, we ask, can credence be given to such an explanation as this? If such a system of interpretation be conceded, what statement of Holy Writ may not be explained away? The whole passage in connexion with the context forms one continuous narrative, related throughout with historical precision and simplicity; for any thing in the style of the record, it would be as reasonable to regard the creation itself as narrated by anticipation, and as not having taken place for many ages after, as to conceive so of the day appointed for its commemoration. The *nature* of the institution also corroborates our view; the creation of the world was an event equally interesting to every man, whether Jew or Gentile. It is equally necessary for one man as for another to cherish the remembrance of the power, wisdom, and goodness of God as displayed in the creation, and to worship the Creator; but is it reasonable to conclude that the commemoration of what equally concerned all the human race, was restricted to one age and one people? Might we not rather expect that this would be extended to all? Or is it likely that the commemoration did not commence for twenty-five centuries after the occurrence of the event to be commemorated? Is it not rather probable that it commenced immediately from the time when that event was completed? This conclusion, which common sense would thus point to, we regard as the explicit statement of the inspired historian. The Sabbath was instituted when none of the human race were in being, except Adam and Eve; we infer, therefore, that it was made

either for them personally and exclusively, or for *all* their descendants; the Jew had no peculiar connexion with Adam, more than the Gentile, and as certainly as we are descended from him, are we under the obligations, and entitled to seek the privileges of the Sabbath, unless it can be shewn that there is a clear divine revelation annulling those obligations, and disfranchising of those privileges. But as no such revelation can be adduced, but much evidence to the contrary exists, we conclude that the Christian as well as the Jew has an interest in the Sabbatical institution, and that "the Sabbath was made for *man*" in the widest sense of the term,—for the whole human race.

An objection to this conclusion has been advanced, however, which has enough of plausibility to merit a reply. It is asked, if the Sabbath were really instituted at the creation, how comes it to pass that the Bible contains little or no record of its observance in the ages before the flood? To this we answer, first, that although we cannot adduce any direct statement on the subject, during the first period of human history, yet we have much collateral evidence in favour of our opinion. Whence, we ask, could have arisen the division of time into *weeks*—a mode of computation strikingly different from that by days, or months, or years, in being founded on no revolution of the heavenly bodies, nor any other visible natural phenomenon; and yet this mode of measuring time has been clearly marked from the first: Abel and Cain presented their offerings "in the end of days," (margin) by which the most judicious commentators understand the seventh day, that is the Sabbath. Noah's history plainly manifests the existence of this custom of reckoning by weeks; when the dove he had sent forth from the ark returned, he waited seven days before he sent her forth a second time, and when she came back with the olive leaf in her mouth, he stayed other seven days before he dismissed her on her final flight. Now why were these trials made on the seventh day, rather

than on the sixth or eighth? Does this not clearly show that the division of time into weeks was known to and observed by him? Was it not also understood by Laban, when he said to Jacob, "Fulfil her week?" The same portion of time was subsequently set apart for nuptial festivities, as appears from the account of Samson's marriage feast, and for special lamentation for the dead, as when Joseph and his brethren mourned for their father seven days. Indeed this division of time is known to have existed in almost all nations, at the earliest periods to which history and tradition reach, as might be proved, were it necessary, on the authority of many heathen writers, who, with more or less reverence, testify of it. It is difficult to conceive any other way of accounting for this fact, than tracing it to some traditionary knowledge of the completion of creation in six days, and the consequent blessing of the seventh, handed down from the family of Noah to succeeding generations.

But had we no such probability to adduce on the subject, it would still be unfair to conclude that because the observance of the Sabbath in those early ages is not formally recorded, therefore it was not observed. There are other equally extraordinary omissions in the sacred narrative. From the birth of Seth to the deluge, a period of fifteen hundred years, no mention is made of *sacrifice;* and for fifteen hundred years more, from the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan to the birth of Christ, no mention is made of *circumcision*, as an existing rite, although we can have no doubt that both were punctually attended to. What is yet more in point, no express record of the keeping of the Sabbath is to be found in the books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the first and second of Samuel, or the first of Kings; so that if the objection referred to be worth any thing, it will prove more than the objector desires, establishing not merely the non-observance of the Sabbath during the patriarchal ages, but also for centuries after the

law was given on Sinai. The truth is, the history, however circumstantial it may be in some particulars, is, on the whole, rapid and compendious, not admitting of detailed accounts of what yet may have been universally attended to; and there can be no reasonable doubt that, during all this time, the Sabbath was observed. If this conclusion be arrived at, an important point is gained; inasmuch as the opponents of the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath themselves admit that, if we can establish the fact of its having been instituted at creation, it must then be regarded as equally binding on the whole human race.

In "remembering the Sabbath-day," our attention is next to be directed to its re-appointment under the Jewish dispensation. How far the Israelites had observed it during their bondage in Egypt, we have no means of accurately ascertaining; their own rabbins, indeed, assert that they were most regular in this duty, and that their deliverance from captivity was the reward of this regularity; but to this testimony we cannot, of course, attach much credit, although it is valuable, as shewing the belief of those rabbins in the antiquity of the institution. It is not likely that their Egyptian tyrants allowed them leisure for any such observance; and indeed they are charged (Ezek xx.) with having been guilty of idolatry while in Egypt. They, therefore, needed a new and striking admonition on the subject, especially in the peculiar circumstances in which they were placed in the wilderness. This was vouchsafed in connexion with the gift of manna; a double portion of the miraculous supply was granted on the sixth day, but on the seventh, the Sabbath, none fell. If a double portion was gathered any other day, it bred worms and putrified, but the increased quantity collected on the sixth day, that the sanctity of the Sabbath might not be violated, was preserved in purity and wholesomeness. Thus did the Lord encircle his own day with a chain of miraculous attestations of his will concerning it. Now, so far from countenancing

the opinion of some that this was the first institution of the Sabbath, the whole narrative bears strong internal evidence that the reverse was the case. We cannot now enter upon a detailed examination of it, but let the impartial enquirer after truth carefully read the sixteenth chapter of Exodus, and judge for himself whether the language of Moses more resembles the first promulgation of a new and extraordinary law, or the incidental mention of one previously well known. We might have expected that in the formal appointment of a new religious ordinance, he would explain why the Sabbath was set apart, and give directions as to the manner in which it was to be observed, but nothing of this kind is recorded; nor do we find the people expressing any such curiosity about the institution of the day, as they did about the nature of the manna; "the rest of the holy Sabbath" is mentioned by him, and heard of by them, as what they were all familiarly acquainted with, however irregular they may have been in their previous observance of it; and the whole narrative contains nothing, we conceive, approaching to an evidence that this was the introduction of a new and totally unknown institution.

Not long after, at the august and momentous promulgation of the law of Sinai, we find the sanctification of the Sabbath not merely casually adverted to, but considered worthy to occupy a tenth of the whole moral law then given by the most high God himself. Accompaniments of the most impressive solemnity attended this promulgation. While the civil and ceremonial law was written by Moses in a book, these precepts were uttered by the voice of Jehovah "out of the midst of the fire, and the cloud, and the great darkness," and were afterwards written by the finger of God on tables of stone; and, as Moses declares, "*he added no more;*" he had now "declared his covenant which he commanded them to perform, even ten commandments;" he had given not a mere *specimen* of his law, accidently distinguished by peculiar circumstances, but a *summary* of its

moral requirements, designedly accompanied by circumstances of unparalleled sublimity and majesty, and on the declaration of the tenth, the voice ceased, "he added no more." And is there not perpetuity stamped upon the obligation of these precepts? Shall man presume to set limits to the duration of their authority? 'Nay,' it is said, 'man does not do it, but by the coming of Christ our position is so altered, that we are released from the binding force of the Jewish code.' A question of the deepest moment is here presented to us—What do the Scriptures teach concerning it? Now the statements in the New Testament, which more or less directly bear on this point, are various, and might, to an ignorant or careless reader, seem at first sight contradictory. On the one hand we are told that "Christ has abolished in his flesh the law of commandments contained in ordinances;" that we are to be "justified by faith without the deeds of the law:" that now "we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held;" that we are "not under the law, but under grace." On the other hand, however, it is declared that "the law is holy, and just, and good;" and that "sin is the transgression of the law;" the Saviour warns us—"Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets, I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." Paul also exhibits the utmost solicitude to avoid the imputation of subverting the law, and cries, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." How are passages apparently so opposed to each other to be reconciled? In order to this, we must carefully distinguish between the *ceremonial* and the *moral* codes. The ceremonial law embraced a system of types, shadows, and emblems, which derived their efficacy only from their being appointed to prefigure the atonement of Christ, and the benefits flowing therefrom to men. This

law was limited in its extent to the Jewish nation, and being designed to prepare the way for a new and better dispensation, was temporary in its duration. Wherefore Christ "took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross;" he fulfilled all its types, and realised all its shadows, and in the same moment when he said, "It is finished," and gave up the ghost, *its* obligation was at an end, it expired also. But the case is widely different as regards the moral law. Christ did indeed deliver us from its curse, by submitting to an accursed death on the cross for us, and thus brought within our reach forgiveness of sins, reconciliation with God, and other inestimable blessings which the violated law could never have procured for us; but he in no degree deprived the law of its authority or lessened its jurisdiction as a rule of life. Its precepts are taken up, enforced, spiritualized in the New Testament, and obedience to them is urged by new and powerful motives. In ancient times, Moses was commanded to put the tables on which this law was written into the ark of the covenant, upon which was the mercy-seat, and over it the cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy-seat, and where the Divine presence was manifested; once in the year was the high priest to enter the holy place as the type of the great High Priest of our profession, and sprinkle the blood of the sacrifice on the mercy seat thus established over the testimony within which was that moral law of which "remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy" constituted so prominent a portion. All this was done in reference to the Redeemer, the true and living mercy-seat, who, while he was to declare God's righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, was also to write the Divine law on the hearts of his people, not mutilating the code by the abstraction of any part, not impairing the strength of any precept, but establishing a throne of grace where help may be obtained to serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear. Though the voice of mercy from Sion is now heard rising sweetly and clearly above the

thunders of Sinai, yet it declares no abrogation of the statutes of heaven; from Calvary itself there goes forth the most impressive exhibition that ever was or could be made of God's spotless holiness and inflexible justice, and he who there bare the iniquity of us all in his own body on the tree, is the Judge who shall come again in power and great glory, to take vengeance on them that *obey not the Gospel*, which he has thus identified, in its moral requirements, with his unchanging and unchangeable law. Of this law, then, the fourth commandment formed a portion; its august place is one of equality with the precepts that require love to God and man; it is set before us as a branch of the first and great commandment, and as such is entitled to the reverence and obedience of all men. No matter whence the opposition to it proceeds—whether it be from some itinerant vender of infidelity, or some self-sufficient dogmatist, who erects his own puny intellect as the tribunal at which God's mandate is to be tried—whether it issue from an illiterate blasphemer, pouring forth his drunken profaneness in a spirit shop, or appear clothed in scholastic diction from the learned seclusion of a college—from whatever source opposition to the law of God proceeds, it is our duty earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints. The higher the quarter from which an attack on scriptural truth is made, or the more specious and logical the reasonings by which that attack is supported, the more unflinching and persevering should the advocates for the whole counsel of God be in crying, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." Col. ii. 8. Surely there is a fearful, an appalling responsibility incurred by the man whose sacrilegious hand attempts to efface this, or any portion of the divine will, from that table on which it was inscribed by the finger of Jehovah himself.

We must notice, however, a ground on which some who admit the perpetual obligation of the other parts of the

decalogue, yet make the law of the Sabbath an exception to this acknowledgment. They insist on the distinction between positive and moral precepts, and placing the Sabbath in the former class, disown its authority. We may remark that by *positive* precepts theologians understand those which are not founded upon any reason obvious to us, but derive their force exclusively from the authority of the Lawgiver, having nothing connected with them to induce their observance, apart from the declaration of his will; while *moral* precepts are those which, from their own inherent excellence and manifest fitness, require universal acknowledgment wherever and whenever it is possible for men to obey them. Much more weight has been attached this distinction than it is at all entitled to; for could the Sabbath be proved to be entirely a *positive* institution, still would the conclusion which some are so ready to draw against its permanence be premature and unwarranted. An observance based upon the *positive* enactments of Divine authority, is, until abrogated by that authority which, having enjoined, has alone a right to repeal it, as strictly a moral obligation, as if it embodied one of the most obvious and immutable principles of right and wrong. *The will of God* is the supreme rule by which the conduct of intelligent creatures should be regulated; and, therefore, as regards our obligation to obey, there can be no difference between his precepts, whether we see the reason of them or not. It is not the *fitness* of moral precepts that makes them binding, but the declaration of God's will—a moral fitness which we cannot understand may have moved him to enjoin those which we call positive; but that is not our immediate concern; what God has said we are bound to believe, *because* he has said it; what God has commanded, we are bound to do, *because* he has commanded it. From this principle, (which is as undeniable as it is important,) it results, that could those who insist that the Sabbath is altogether a positive institution, fully establish their assertion,

they would still have gained little towards the disproof of its permanence, unless they could farther show that it was formally abrogated by Divine authority; inasmuch as, although the establishment of its moral nature might imply its perpetuity, the proof of its being entirely positive would not necessarily imply its cessation.

But we are far from admitting that it is entirely positive. The duty it enjoins is, on the contrary, in the highest degree, moral. The commandment is, indeed, positive in fixing the precise proportion of time to be set apart for that duty; for any reason we can see to the contrary, God might have extended creation over seven or eight days, instead of six, and so made the eighth or the ninth day that which should commemorate his rest. But the admission that this part of the precept is positive, has no tendency to overthrow its general moral character. If social worship be a duty, it is right, indeed necessary, that some definite time should be appropriated to it; and who had so good a right to fix what this should be as the God who has given us all our time, teaching us that it is a talent for the employment of which we are responsible to himself? But though we regard the command thus as of a mixed nature, we see its moral purposes standing prominently out; and if we briefly review these purposes, we shall discover additional reason for believing that an institution, the utility and applicability of which are equally great to all, was designed to be universal and permanent.

The Sabbath is mercifully enjoined as a day of rest from bodily toil. How necessary this is, all who have observed in others, or felt in themselves the "wear and tear" of constant occupation will readily admit. The animal frame is so constructed by its Maker as to need intervals of repose, in want of which it becomes prematurely exhausted. Sleep is, to a certain extent, nature's restorer; but this proportion of rest does not afford sufficient compensation to the relaxed system, and such an interval as the Sabbath pre-

sents, is a most salutary appointment for the recovery of the vigour essential to health and long life. But surely there was nothing in the termination of the Jewish dispensation to render this less necessary. The body of a Jew was not more susceptible of fatigue than is that of a Christian; there is no anatomical or physiological difference to be detected; there has been no new power of endurance or tenure of longevity imparted under the Christian system; and if the attainment of this purpose of the Sabbath be as essential now as it was before, may we not believe that he who is not the God of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles, has continued the merciful law by which it was to be secured. The argument is similar with regard to the inferior animals. The institution was designed as an ordinance of mercy to them also, proceeding from him whose "tender mercies are over all his works." Their exemption from toil on a day appointed by God, not merely concedes the sovereign right of God in them, and admits that man holds his claim on their services by a tenure entirely dependant on the will of the Creator, but also provides means for the preservation of the animal's health and comfort; while it opens a channel for the gushing forth of the spirit of the merciful man, "who," as Scripture teaches us, "is merciful to his beast." But this rest was not more needed for the ox and ass of Judea than it is for our animals, and we cannot believe that God has withdrawn it from these.

But the Sabbath was ordained as more than a day of rest. It was especially instituted for the commemoration of God's creative work, and for other devotional purposes; it was to be a day set apart for the worship of God, the acknowledgment of his past goodness, and the pursuit of those farther blessings that our souls require; it was to be a day of holy convocation, when the feet of the pious might tread the courts of the temple, and they who loved the name of the Lord might take sweet counsel together. And are not these moral duties of perpetual obligation? Has religious cul-

tivation become of less importance? Are the means for working out salvation less necessary? Was it right that the Jew should appropriate a seventh portion of his time exclusively to those purposes, and is it not equally right that the Christian should do so also.

The Sabbath is also set before us as a *typical institution.* I do not now refer to the beautiful, though somewhat fanciful idea adopted by many divines, both Jewish and Christian, that the whole course of our world was prefigured in the model of the first seven days—that, as "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day"—so the six days of creative operation correspond with six thousand years, during which it is supposed the church shall continue in its militant and comparatively oppressed state, while the seventh day, "the rest of God," points to the triumphant rest which is emphatically called the millennium. But however this may be, we have unquestionable authority for regarding the Sabbath as typical of *heaven.* Paul makes this character of it the foundation of a considerable part of his argument in Heb. iv. leading to the conclusion that "a rest remaineth for the people of God" of which the rest of the Sabbath is an apposite type. Now, according to the plainest principles of interpretation, the type must remain in force until the arrival of the antitype; it was so with the ceremonies of the old law, and so, we may reasonably conclude, it shall be with the Sabbath. So far from having passed away with the Jewish dispensation, it still abides, and shall retain its binding force, and continue to impart its blessings, until the antitype shall fully come—until all the people of God, the whole believing body, shall enter on the heavenly Sabbath, when, in a sense more strict and literal than any in which God can be said to rest, they shall rest from their labours, and be for ever with the Lord.

Thus we perceive, on the whole, that while this commandment is partly positive, it is also, in a high degree,

moral, and that its obligation is such as to bear, with equal if not increased force upon us, as upon those who lived in former ages. There is no possibility of lessening the obligation of this precept, without in the same degree relaxing the authority of the remainder of the decalogue. For example, if the fourth commandment be not binding, why should the seventh? There is a very observable analogy between them. The Sabbath and marriage were both instituted in paradise, during man's state of innocence: both may be regarded as enactments, partly of a positive character; the fourth commandment is given to guard the sanctity of the one institution, and the seventh to prohibit the violation of the other. Who is authorised to say that the one shall continue in authority, but that the other shall lose its force? We are bold to assert that to deny the obligation of the Sabbath is, in effect, to undermine the whole moral law, to break down the salutary barriers which God's commandments have erected in our world, and to let a flood of Antinomian licentiousness loose to spread its desolating influences far and wide.

While God has thus established his law as to the keeping of *a* Sabbath, he has also distinctly revealed his will that a seventh portion of our time should be set apart for it. It does not appear, however, that it is essential to the institution that it should be observed on any particular day, unchangeably. It is distinctly provided that the seventh day after six of labour, shall be kept holy; but it is not stipulated that this shall always be the seventh day *of the week*. The blessing is annexed not to the seventh day, but to the Sabbath, on whatever day it be held. Indeed it could not be determined from the language of the fourth commandment what day was fixed on. And it is obviously impossible that we can be bound to celebrate the return of the same identical hours which constituted the Sabbath, where it was originally instituted. In some countries the day is calculated from sunset to sunset; and in others, as amongst

ourselves, from midnight to midnight. The Sabbath, as a day, cannot possibly be observed at the same time in all parts of the world; the attempt to effect this would require many abstruse and difficult calculations; but assuredly, men may be true Christians, without being profound astronomers or mathematicians, they may walk in the commandments and ordinances of God blamelessly, without engaging in deep scientific research; they may distinctly understand and savingly follow the injunctions of the inspired penmen without having emulated the studies or even heard the names of Copernicus, or Newton, or Herschell.

From these and similar considerations it follows, we conceive, that the rest enjoined by the commandment may be lawfully observed on any day of the week on which we have reason to believe that it has been *established by proper authority*. Let particular attention, however, be directed to this limitation: man is not at his own convenience or caprice to choose a day for himself; if this were tolerated, all order would be overthrown, the observance of the Sabbath as a day of holy convocation would be rendered impracticable, and in short, the main ends of its establishment would be frustrated. It is only by the authority of the Legislator himself that such a change can be made. Now it is well known that we observe our Sabbath on a different day from that on which it was originally kept. (Indeed some have ingeniously endeavoured to prove that, at the departure from Egypt, a day was accidentally lost, by which the Sabbath fell out of its established course, and was shifted a day back, and that, at our Lord's resurrection, there was, in a similar way, the gain or advance of a day, by which the original Sabbath was restored, the first day of our week corresponding, on this supposition, to what was the seventh day of the creation week: this, however, we must regard as a mere speculation, which, although it may possibly be true, is altogether destitute of Scriptural proof.) The question then arises, why has the alteration taken

place? And have we any satisfactory reason for believing that the transfer has been made not by mere human authority, but with the sanction of him who is "Lord of the Sabbath also."

Let it be premised here, that there is no reason why a *second*, an additional consideration may not be urged to enforce the observance of the Sabbath. It was so in the Jewish history. While the institution ever retained its great original reason—the commemoration of creation, another, although a subordinate reason is also assigned to excite the people's regard for it: "Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm; therefore, the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." Deut. v. 15. Now, carrying out this principle, there can be no difficulty in believing that he who added the deliverance from Egypt as a reason why the Jews should observe this command, might add, in like manner, the great deliverance effected by Christ for the human race, as a reason which must bear with intense power on the understandings and hearts of all who value Gospel salvation. But as redemption is a work of surpassing excellence, it must not hold the subordinate place of a mere secondary reason here. "First, in the divine estimate of excellence and glory, it must be first in man's grateful and reverential commemoration. How then shall its superior importance be marked in the celebration? Why, in order to give it the lead, the day shall be changed. Creation had the day formerly; redemption shall have it now. Not, in either case, exclusively. The Sabbatical commemoration of creation would necessarily, from the time of the fall and the first promise, be associated in the minds of devout, believing worshippers with the anticipation of the promised redemption, and the Creator be worshipped as the God of salvation. And, in like manner, on the Christian Sabbath, the God of grace, the God and Father of our

Lord Jesus Christ, is worshipped, not to the exclusion of his creative power, although with special reference to his redeeming mercy. Redemption only takes the lead, as it is so pre-eminently entitled to do, among the subjects of celebration; and in this way the change of the day no more alters the nature of the duty, than if redemption had only been introduced as an additional reason, and the former day had been retained. A divinely authorised change in the time is not Divine abrogation. The change of the day does not essentially change the thing."*

The question then is, have we sufficient authority for rejecting the seventh day of the week, and substituting the first in its place? It is admitted that there is no direct precept, in so many words, commanding this change, but we believe that the Divine will, as ascertained by legitimate inference from the statements of Scripture, is as binding on us as if it were made known by express precept. In the circumstances in which the primitive Christian church was placed, a formal enactment on the subject would be attended with serious inconveniences. The Jewish polity still remained, by which the observance of the seventh day was established, and its violation punished by the penalty of death; and as the first converts were from amongst the Jews (many years having elapsed before the apostles were directed to "turn to the Gentiles") it was obviously necessary that the change should be unostentatiously introduced, and that a certain degree of indulgence should be allowed on this subject, as we know was the case with respect to the ceremonial law. "Seeing, then, that so long as the Jewish polity remained, the law of the land guarded the seventh day of the week from being desecrated by labour; and that, as the greater number of the first converts were persons from the humbler walks of life, whose Jewish masters or employers would not, we may be assured, allow them to

* Wardlaw's Discourses on the Sabbath, p. 91.

abstain altogether from labour on the first day, it was quite in accordance with the general toleration on the subject of Judaism, to allow some indulgence in changing the Sabbath from the day on which the Jews observed it, to the first day of the week. For the Lord of the Sabbath to direct the apostles to begin immediately, and mark out the first day, by meeting on it for religious exercises, and to introduce the substitution of that day for the seventh, by degrees, as far as circumstances would allow, till the Jewish polity was overthrown, is a plan recommending itself to our reason, because it was so admirably adapted to the circumstances of the first Christians, and so strictly in accordance with the general toleration of Jewish prejudices. The change once being fully established by such high authority, a plain notice of it, recorded in the New Testament, was obviously sufficient to point out the path of duty to all enlightened, conscientious Christians, in every future period of the church."*

That such "plain notices" of the religious observance of the first day of the week, are given, is too evident to admit of doubt. The Lord himself magnified the day, and made it honourable, by arising from the dead on its morning. During the whole of the Jewish Sabbath he lay in the stillness of the grave, and under the dominion of death, but on the morning of the first day he arose from the tomb, leading captivity captive, triumphing over death and hell, and giving assurance to all that his sacrifice had been accepted, and the mighty work of atonement fully accomplished. Here was a new era in the history of the human race; here was an event compared to which the creation of the world was poor in its glory, and limited in

* See a series of admirable "Letters on the Sabbath," in the Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine, for 1833, to which, as well as to Dr. Wardlaw's comprehensive and convincing "Discourses," the writer of these pages is happy to acknowledge his obligation for several ideas on the subject under consideration.

its importance, and it was but reasonable, as we have already observed, that an occurrence of such stupendous moment should ever after be celebrated with peculiar honours, that the day signalized by the Lord's resurrection should receive, as it did, the appellation of "the Lord's day," and that, on this day, which the Lord had not only made, but consecrated, by becoming on it, in the fullest sense, "the head-stone of the corner," the righteous, through all succeeding generations, should rejoice and be glad. On this day, Christ appeared to his disciples. Again, on the next Sunday, did he visit them, and it is particularly worthy of remark that we have no account of his appearing to them during the intervening week, as if he designed to confer additional honour on this day, by distinguishing the two first celebrations of the Christian Sabbath by his own personal presence. On the first day of the week the gracious and glorious Pentecostal effusion of the Holy Spirit took place, thus connecting it with the complete and perfect opening of the Christian dispensation. The custom of assembling on this day, thus introduced by the apostles, was subsequently acted on as a settled practice by the different churches, however remote from each other. Thus we read, Acts xx. 6, 7: "And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas, in five days, where we abode seven days. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his speech until midnight." Here we learn that it was their custom to come together on Sunday to hear preaching, to partake of the Lord's supper, and for other religious exercises, and it appears that the apostle waited a whole week for the arrival of this day. Similar information is given us, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, where we find Paul exhorting the Corinthian church, "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first

day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." It was customary amongst the Jews to make collections for the poor *on every Sabbath*, which were deposited in a purse called "the purse of the alms," corresponding to our poor's box; to this the apostle seems to refer, enjoining that on *their* Sabbath they should act likewise; after six days of labour, during which God might have given them greater or less degrees of success in their worldly avocations, they were to come together on the day of rest in which earthly business was to be suspended, and then, in connection with their other duties, to put into the sacred treasury contributions for the relief of the needy, bearing a fair proportion to the prosperity vouchsafed. That from the time of the apostles downwards, the observance of the first day prevailed in the various churches, is abundantly attested by the most ancient and credible historians of the early centuries. Justin Martyr, who wrote within fifty years after the closing of the sacred volume, says, "On the day called Sunday we meet together either in the city or the country, we read the writings of the prophets and apostles, the president delivers an appropriate exhortation, we all unite in prayer, and conclude with the celebration of the Eucharist." Many similar testimonies might be adduced to prove that the early Christians set apart the first day of the week instead of the seventh, thus confirming us in our belief that the change was made on no meaner authority than that of the apostles, who derived their power to do so from the Divine Head of the church himself. And indeed this sanctification of the first day of the week may be regarded, in some sense, as a confession of Christian faith; by dedicating *any* day to the worship of the Supreme Being, we imply our belief "that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him;" by setting apart one day in seven, we avow that our God is the God of the Bible, who completed the work of creation

in six days, and rested on, and sanctified the seventh; but by observing our rest—not on Saturday, but on Sunday, we declare that we are not shrouded under the veil of Judaism, but recognise that Jesus whom the Jews slew, as our Saviour, our risen and ascended Lord.

There is another argument on this point, which, however little it may weigh in the estimation of the Scribes and proud disputers of this world, comes with so much power to the heart of the humble and devout Christian, that it ought not to be omitted in any enumeration, however rapid, of the proofs that the day has been changed by Divine authority. It is that God has owned, and continues to own, the first day of the week as his Sabbath, by transferring to it the blessing originally pronounced. If it were a change made on merely human authority, assuredly he who has denounced an accumulation of plagues against those who add to what is revealed as his will, would not make this so peculiarly a time of love, and distinguish it by special outpourings of his grace. On this day he refreshes his inheritance by increased effusions of his Holy Spirit; he brings his friends into his banquetting house, and unfurls over them his banner of love; he manifests himself unto them not only as he does not unto the world, but even as he does not to themselves at other times; he is with them in the breaking of bread; he makes their hearts to burn within them, by opening to them the Scriptures. Does not the fact that God so graciously accepts his people's service on this day, prove that it is not "a strange offering," but one of his own appointment? Then, Christian believer, to you we can appeal for a confirmation of all our reasonings. You *feel* that this is the Lord's day, and in your experience and that of his church universal, God bears a lasting testimony to his will on the subject, and thus the broad seal of heaven's approbation is stamped on the institution of the Christian Sabbath. You can enter into the meaning of an eminent advocate of the Lord's day, (Dr. Wardlaw,) when he says,

"I could not desire a more convincing proof that a man's heart is 'not right with God,'—that there is a secret spiritual declension, a 'leaving of the first love,' than the discovery of a disposition to insinuate doubts about the obligation of the Sabbath, and to do this with a listless *sang-froid*, and without any apparent shrinking or trembling of heart at the conclusion;—nor can I fancy a clearer evidence of a church 'having a name to live while it is dead,' or a more ominous symptom of its approaching darkness and desolation, than the prevalence of such a spirit,—the rise and progress of a tendency to speculate about the abrogation, or even about the curtailment of the Sabbath." (Discourses, p. 96.)

SERMON II.

THE SANCTIFICATION OF THE SABBATH.

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy."—Exodus xx. 8.

It is evident that the importance which our minds will attach to the *sanctification* of the Sabbath, must be in proportion to the fixedness of our belief in its perpetual obligation. If we regard it as a merely Jewish institution, continued to our day from motives of expediency, and like 'Christmas-day, Good Friday, or Holy Thursday,' deriving its obligation from the authority of the church, we must concede a degree of latitude as to the strictness with which it is to be observed that will vary according to the judgment or the caprice of different individuals; whereas, if we admit it to rest upon Divine authority, as an institution designed by God to be permanent and universal, we cannot arrogate to ourselves any such liberty, but must humbly search the inspired record, to ascertain what is the will of the supreme Legislator, as to the manner in which his own day is to be kept. It has been the object of the preceding discourse to present a summary of the principal arguments by which the latter view of the subject may be maintained, if the force of these reasonings be admitted and felt, all who desire to do the will of God, "having respect unto all his commandments,' will deal with this institution as scrupulously and reverently as with any other of the weightier matters of the law, and will feel as deep an inter-

est in the inquiry, 'How ought the Sabbath to be observed?' as in the investigation of the length and breadth of the requirements of any other portion of the moral code.

What, then, is the rule by which our obedience is to be regulated? Are the various prohibitions scattered through the Mosaic law to be enforced in our day, or had the institution, under the Jewish economy, peculiarities designed to pass away with that dispensation? This question has been represented as one of extreme difficulty; but if it be, it has been made so only by the subtleties and sophisms with which speculative theologians have encumbered the simple principles of duty. A plain key to its solution is found, we apprehend, in the distinction (already adverted to) between the moral law of the Jews, which was designed to be permanently obligatory, and the political and ceremonial precepts which specially applied to them as a people. What is contained in the decalogue is fully as binding on us as it was on them, but what was enacted in the Levitical rules being, in many parts, peculiarly adapted to *them*, in circumstances which have had no parallel in the history of the world, we do not regard as surviving the abolition of other portions of the ceremonial law. Not that these prohibitions are altogether destitute of use to us; they manifest the way in which the great Lawgiver himself carried out the requirements of his law, in certain circumstances; and even where we are justified in claiming exemption from their *letter*, they inculcate the *spirit* in which the details of the commandment should be attended to. It is, however, from the fourth commandment that we chiefly derive the knowledge of *our* duty as to the Sabbath; what it prohibits, we are bound to shun; what it enjoins, we are bound to engage in with heart and hand.

As we look into this law, our attention is first attracted by the prohibition of labour on the Sabbath day, which is conveyed in language so strong and unequivocal, as to seem

designed to drive the caviller from every subterfuge, and to make the interpretation of this part of the commandment so plain, that he who runneth may read it. Six days are granted, in which diligence in those pursuits by which our temporal necessities are to be supplied, is not only allowed, but enjoined: "Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work"—not indeed so as to forget God, for a sense of his presence should be kept up through every occupation: but the seventh day, it is peremptorily commanded, shall be separated from any such mixture of earthly and heavenly engagements, and so appropriated to the service of God as that nothing shall be permitted to interfere with its sanctity. "In it thou shalt not do *any* work," all is to be done in the six days allotted to labour, and, consequently, none suffered to remain for the day consecrated to God; and not only art thou to rest from toil thyself, but thou art not to require thy children or thy servants to work—thou art not to connive at their doing so—thou art not to withhold any exercise of thine influence or authority, by which their violation of the law may be prevented.

While, however, we direct notice to the strong and unambiguous force of the expressions thus used, we have authority from the words and example of the Saviour, and the general tenor of Holy Writ, for interpreting them with certain qualifications, which it may be well to advert to here, that the exceptions being disposed of, we may see more clearly the great extent of what is really implied by the prohibition. Works of *necessity* and *mercy* are generally spoken of as the exceptions, and that those works which properly come under these characters, may be performed consistently with the holiness of the Sabbath, is undeniable. Men admit this statement most readily, so that we need not occupy in proving it, time that may be more profitably employed in guarding against the abuses of the concession into which there is such a proneness to slide. Let it be remembered, then, that in order to their being

justifiable, the works done on the Sabbath as *necessary*, must be really such; deriving their urgency from circumstances which could not have been anticipated or controlled and which require that immediate attention should be rendered to them; and those done as works of *mercy*, must partake of the character of necessity, and be such as could not be done on other days with equal advantage to the objects of our care. We are not to make a necessity for ourselves, by commencing in the week worldly business to such an extent as will unavoidably leave some of it lying over to be done on the Sabbath. That an act is more convenient or profitable, if done on this, than it would be on any other day, does not constitute a case of necessity sufficiently strong to make it lawful. It may sometimes be very convenient for a person who is travelling on business, to remain in one place until Saturday night, and perform a journey on the Sabbath, so as to be ready to commence at another place on Monday morning:—it may be profitable to engage in commerce on the Lord's-day; perhaps an opportunity may then present itself of effecting a most advantageous purchase or sale, which will be lost if not immediately embraced: but can there be a doubt in any well-instructed mind, that to yield to any of these inducements, would be to profane the Sabbath? We should guard against the vain and presumptuous multiplication of cases of necessity, and where such a case clearly exists, we should devote to it no more time or labour than is indispensably requisite. We conceive that under our dispensation we are permitted to prepare food on the Sabbath, but certainly this permission does not warrant us to make it a day of feasting, distinguished from other days by the richness and variety of our food, and the accumulation of exertion and anxiety on our servants. There is not any impropriety in using our horses to convey us to places of worship, or on errands of mercy,—for what we may lawfully engage in ourselves, we may surely employ the inferior animals to assist us to ac-

complish,—but this license does not reach to the employment of horses and equipages for purposes of ostentation and luxury, without any thing in the distance, or the weather, or the state of our health, to render walking impracticable or dangerous; nor does it justify the selection of a remote place of worship in preference to a nearer, merely for sake of the pleasure to be derived from travelling. A physician or surgeon is unquestionably not violating the Sabbath by visiting patients, or performing operations, under certain circumstances; to refuse to do so, on the plea of religious principle, would be to outrage humanity, and to disregard the precept and example of him who has said, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice;" but if he spend the day in professional pursuits, merely for his own convenience or profit, without such an urgency in the cases under his care as that his visits could not without injury be made on the Saturday, or postponed to the Monday, he abuses his privilege, and disobeys the command. The appropriation of a part of the day to the religious instruction of the ignorant and the young, is not only allowable, but laudable, and in some cases obligatory, and Sunday schools are entitled to rank high amongst the efforts of Christian benevolence, for the advancement of God's glory and man's welfare; but they are good, they are innocent, only because their object is religious; because all the knowledge communicated in them is designed to lead to spiritual blessings. Were they to degenerate into schools for the instruction of the poor in trades or in general literature, they would wholly overstep the boundary prescribed; for, however useful and merciful it may be to lead the indigent into a way of obtaining a livelihood, yet every work of utility and mercy is not allowable on the Sabbath, and we can regard those schools alone as lawful, in which the salvation of the soul is the grand object to the attainment of which every effort is directed. So again, the management of the merely secular interests of public charities, is undoubtedly an act of

mercy ; yet we cannot regard the consumption of the Sabbath in such employment, as consonant with its design. To say that those concerned have not time to do the business on week days, is in effect to avow that they will dedicate to the cause of benevolence only that which doth cost them nothing, and that the portion of time set apart for religious exercises shall be unhesitatingly infringed on, rather than the slightest subtraction shall be suffered from that appropriated to worldly pursuits. It would be easy to multiply such illustrations as these of the abuses of the exceptions, allowed to be made to the literal interpretation of the fourth commandment, but it is not necessary. Let each individual sit in conscientious judgment on his own principles and conduct. If we have a proper tenderness of conscience, and a true spirit of devotion, our effort will be not to discover how far we may secularize the day without sin, but how fully we may be saved from every approach to worldliness of spirit ; we will exercise a holy jealousy over ourselves, lest we withhold from, or grudge to our good Lord, any part of the day he claims for himself, we will feel as did Archbishop Dawes, when he said, ' Am I so afraid of sabbatizing with the Jews, that I carelessly omit keeping the day as a good Christian ? Where can be the harm of overdoing in God's worship, suppose I could overdo ? But when my Saviour has told me, after I have done all, I am still an unprofitable servant, where is the hazard, where the possibility of doing too much ; whereas, in doing too little, in falling short of performing a due obedience on the Sabbath, I may also fall short of eternal life ?'

It follows, then, that with such exceptions as we have scriptural authority for making, *all* worldly business is to be suspended on the Lord's day. There is to be no buying or selling, or getting gain. The cessation is to be not partial, but total. Closing the doors and shutters of places of business does not amount to the rest required, and yet

how many act as if they supposed some such slight outward observance to be amply sufficient. A merchant closes his office, and perhaps would refuse to engage in his ordinary traffic, but in his own apartment he does not scruple to make up his week's accounts, and write letters of business. A farmer does not exact labour from his servants or cattle, but he goes about his grounds watching the progress of his crops, and laying plans for the occupations of the coming week. A tradesman is not actually engaged in manual operations, but he is soliciting custom, or seeking payment from those indebted to him. And so in very many other instances, there is only a partial and external submission to the precept. But how lamentably erroneous must be the views men form of the character of the Searcher of hearts, and of the extent of the spiritual requirements of his law, if they suppose such mockery as this to be acceptable service. God's command is, "Thou shalt not do *any* work;" now, carnal reasonings will often fight against the self-denial and sacrifice that implicit obedience may require; some will feel it a difficult duty to abstain from business in which their competitors in trade are profitably engaging; others, who are in the employment of ungodly persons, will find it an especially painful task to refuse to make a bargain or go upon a journey on the Sabbath, when that refusal may probably be followed by the loss of an otherwise desirable situation. Various circumstances similar to these, occur in every day life. But can there be any difficulty in determining what ought to be done in such cases, if we take scriptural principles for our guide? Does not the question obviously resolve itself into this—whether is God or Mammon to be the master? Ought we, or ought we not, to obey God rather than man? Is he a wise buyer who purchases the gain of the world at the price of his soul's ruin? Must not the curse of heaven be on money acquired by desecration of the Lord's day, making it breed worms, and putrify, like the manna which the Israelites col-

lected in violation of the divine command? And, on the other hand, did any man ever ultimately lose by a sacrifice made at the call of duty? In many instances a firm refusal to profane the Sabbath will not be followed by any such distressing consequences as are apprehended, for the hearts of all men are in the hand of God, and he can dispose them to favour his servants; but supposing the worst fears to be realized, is not He the Amen, the faithful and true Witness, who has declared that there is no man who has made sacrifices for his sake and the gospel's, who "shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting?"

Not only, however, is the Sabbath to be observed by cessation from the ordinary labour of the week, but also by abstinence from those pleasures and recreations, which, though innocent on other days, would be unlawful on the day set apart for religious exercises. There is a striking description, Isa. lviii. 13, of the manner in which God requires his holy day to be kept; and the passage appears to be altogether independent of allusion to any peculiarities connected with the Jewish Sabbath, and therefore applicable to the institution under any dispensation. Now, in this verse, we find a prohibition twice recorded against indulgence in those pleasures, which, (with a humiliating reference to the tendency of man's fallen nature to seek enjoyment in what is opposed to the will of God,) are emphatically called 'our own pleasures.' The iteration of this prohibition should not be overlooked. The inspired penman did not fall into an unmeaning tautology when he represented the Most High as saying, "if thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day," and immediately adding, "not finding thine own pleasure:" he appears rather to have been led to the repetition, in order to denounce more strongly that evasion of the law which so many have attempted by indulging in amusement, although they rested from toil. It is evident we do not

now advert principally to the drunkenness and other gross excesses, in which some revel on the Lord's day: thus with melancholy ingenuity, contriving to redouble and accumulate their iniquity, by superadding to the guilt of the act perpetrated,—the guilt of also profaning the Sabbath; but rather to the conduct of the more orderly and decorous, who, under pretence of benefiting their health after the confinement of the week, or of enjoying innocent recreation and social intercourse, occupy the whole, or a part of the day, in amusements which have no tendency to glorify God, or to save the souls of themselves or others. Some, although they would not travel on business, see no evil in travelling for pleasure, not considering that thus they not only mispend the day themselves, but also encourage, or compel others to violate it; and, moreover, cruelly rob the inferior animals of the rest that their Creator and ours has willed them to enjoy. Very many find their own pleasure on the Sabbath in *walking*,—not merely to the house of God, or on errands of mercy, not because it is absolutely required by their state of health, not alone in retirement to pursue self-examination, or contemplation on the works and word of God, or in the society of a Christian friend, to converse on topics of spiritual concern—in all which cases the exercise is allowable; but avowedly for pleasure—to enjoy worldly company—to pass time that would otherwise roll heavily—to see other saunterers and strollers, and to be seen of them—or for some other purpose equally unsuited to the spirit of the day. *Dining parties*, in which the hours are passed in giddy festivity, where there is no more spiritual recognition of the presence of God, than there was at Belshazzar's feast, furnish others with a favourite mode of finding their own pleasure. With the same object in view, others again are found gratifying themselves in light and unprofitable reading; a popular novel, the last review, the newspaper, whiles away the Sabbath evening. Or, perhaps, with a greater apparent attention

to propriety, works of history or science are studied, which, however valuable may be the information they contain, are certainly not suited to maintain the spiritual frame that befits the season. Every thing that tends to draw away the affections from heavenly objects, is dangerous, and will be avoided by those who desire to "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy."

An especial guard is to be kept over the *words of our lips*. If idle, vain, frivolous language be criminal on any day, it surely becomes invested with deeper guilt on the Sabbath. But this is not all: as various actions which are lawful and necessary on other days, are not admissible on this, so conversation to which, during the week, no blame could attach, would not be innocent on the Lord's day. To talk on matters of worldly business, on politics, or other secular themes, is to overstep the limits defined by that rule, "not speaking thine own words." There is often, even amongst well disposed people, mere worldly conversation, even about religious matters; and as the temptations to err in this respect are very numerous, as we sometimes almost imperceptibly slide from serious and profitable topics, to those which are foreign to the sanctity of the day, we cannot be too circumspect, lest we offend with our tongues.

Let it never be forgotten, however, that the requirements of God's law reach to the heart, and that as the sixth commandment may be violated by the indulgence of a feeling of revenge or undue anger, or the seventh by a single look of unlicensed desire; so the fourth may be profaned within the heart, although no word be spoken, no action committed, that amounts to outward sin. If our affections be fixed on our business or pleasure, if our thoughts be permitted to dwell on the recollection of the secular concerns of the past week, or the anticipation of those to be engaged in on the morrow; if we feel dissatisfaction that our worldly pursuits have been interrupted by the Sabbath,

and entertain a desire to have the day ended, similar to that which led the profane Jews to cry "when will the Sabbath be gone, that we may sell corn, and set forth wheat?"—with such a state of soul, all our outward conformity to the law, must be but hypocritical or superstitious, and our incense a vain offering to the Searcher of hearts.

More than all this, however, is necessary to the proper sanctification of the day. It is not enough that we rest from labour, and abstain from the performance of what is forbidden;—we must also be active and industrious in the engagements that befit the Sabbath. If cessation from toil were all the law required, then the ox and the ass could obey it, as well as the Christian. The Sabbath is not to be a day of indolence and idleness; although, indeed, it seems to be regarded as such by many, who begin by resigning to sleep or luxurious sloth, a portion of its hours, during which, they would be awake and diligent if there were any worldly gain to be pursued; and who afterwards lounge and loiter it away in a listless inactivity, that dishonours God, and altogether frustrates (so far as they are concerned,) the principal designs of the institution. The true worshipper regards it as "a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable." Prizing it above every other day, he looks forward to it with elevated expectation. Like the Jews of old, he makes the preceding day, if not in name, yet in reality, 'the preparation,' in which his worldly affairs are so ordered, that he can enter on the day of rest, without the distractions and anxieties of earthly business: nor does he neglect amidst these efforts, to seek by earnest prayer, that preparation of heart which God alone can bestow, and which is essential to his deriving from the Sabbath, the benefits it is calculated to impart. He arises early with the joyous feeling, that the festival day has arrived, when he is to be permitted to feast with the saints at the table of the Great King himself, and to unite with

those that keep holiday. It is the day which the Lord has made and blessed: shall he not rejoice and be glad in it? He *does* rejoice; he *is* glad. He is glad as he meditates on creation; he is more glad as he meditates on redemption. He is, like David of old, "glad when they say unto him, let us go into the house of the Lord." The tabernacles of God are amiable unto him, and esteeming a day in God's courts better than a thousand, he hastens to array himself in the beauty of holiness, that he may appear in Zion before God. In prayer, in praise, in hearing the words of eternal life, in partaking of the appointed emblems of the Saviour's dying love, he looks for, and experiences the presence of the great Master of assemblies. And the good which he thus seeks for himself, he, to the utmost of his ability, brings within the reach, and presses on the attention of others, particularly his own family and household; amongst the particulars which, by the great Sabbatic law, he is commanded to "remember," one is the spiritual oversight of his children and servants, and he takes earnest heed not to let this slip from his memory. He makes such arrangements as will allow all under his care, to attend on the public worship of God, and as far as is practicable, he takes them with him to the sanctuary. In the hours not occupied by public worship, or other social means of grace, he has no difficulty in finding suitable employment; he cannot, indeed, understand the complaint of those who describe the Sabbath as hanging heavily upon their hands; the performance of acts of necessity or mercy to others,—the instruction of those immediately included within his own domestic circle, in the things that pertain to their everlasting interests,—closet devotions, consisting of self-examination, prayer, reading and meditating on the word of God, and religious books, are found amply sufficient to engage his energies, and prevent his feeling, at any moment of the Sabbath, that he has nothing to do. And whatever he does, he does it heartily, as unto the

Lord, exhibiting to others an example of the manner in which the Lord's day ought to be observed, and experiencing within his own soul, the extent to which it may be enjoyed.

Many of you, my Christian friends, will readily admit that there is nothing exaggerated in this description—that the standard has not been raised above the scriptural rule —and that all I have stated, and more, ought to be felt and performed by those who are truly "in the spirit on the Lord's day." Let such remember that their happiness will depend on their adding obedience to their knowledge of the divine will; let them examine themselves; let them judge themselves, that they be not judged of the Lord. But perhaps some are ready to say, 'If a standard so high and strict is to be erected, man may be said to be made for the Sabbath, with more propriety than the Sabbath can be said to be made for man; if the whole day is to be occupied in devotional exercises, it will change it from a festival to a season of gloom and painful restraint.' To this we reply, that although we admit and contend for the Scriptural assertion that "the Sabbath was made for man," we yet cannot see the force or propriety of the conclusion that *therefore* man is at liberty to *unmake it*—to divert it from the purposes for which it was instituted, so as in whole, or in part to secularize it, and thus to divest it altogether of its Sabbatical character. It *was* made for man, in the sense of being intended and adapted for the promotion of his best interests, for the communication to him of blessings of present and eternal value; but these ends can be attained only in the way that the Lord of the Sabbath has ordained. Like every other talent, this may be so abused, as not only to forfeit the good that might have been derived from it, but to pervert it into a savour of death unto death. Moreover, to complain of the strictness with which the day is to be appropriated to religious duties and enjoyments, is to give lamentably clear evidence of an alienation of heart

from God and holiness. Let me seriously and earnestly ask those who are conscious of such feelings, have you ever meditated on the nature of the blessedness of heaven, as it is set forth in the word of God? You, no doubt, wish that this blessedness may finally be yours; but have you brought home to your minds the facts, that heaven is the great anti-type to which the Sabbath points, and that the enjoyments and occupations of a well-spent Sabbath here, differ, not in essence and spirit, but only in adventitious circumstances from those that shall endure above, in the eternal "sabbatism that remaineth for the people of God?" The reward which the Bible holds forth to the faithful is not a Mohammedan paradise of voluptuous gratification, nor a Hindoo heaven of abstraction from activity, if not from consciousness; but on the contrary, a state of holiness so spotless, that not a thought of sin can find admission there, and of activity so energetic, that they who are nearest the throne of God, "serve him day and night in his temple," by incessantly repeated acts of adoration and praise. Now, heaven is a prepared place for a prepared people. None shall be admitted there, but those who here below learn to relish its pleasures. But it is too obvious to need proof, that they who account it a weariness to dedicate one day in seven to devotional exercises, are not in a state of preparation to find supreme blessedness in the consecration, not of any portion of time, but of the whole of eternity, to such employments. If then we are correct in our view of the manner in which the Sabbath ought to be observed, the objection referred to, instead of doing injury to the institution against which it is levelled, recoils on those who advance it, with a force which ought to lead them faithfully and prayerfully to inquire into the grounds on which they suppose themselves meet for the inheritance of the saints of light.

The views thus put forward with regard to the obligation and observance of the Lord's day cannot be summed

up more briefly and appropriately than in the words of the confession of faith of the Church of Scotland: 'As it is of the law of nature, that, in general, a due proportion of time be set apart for the worship of God, so, in his word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, binding all men in all ages, he hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto him: which, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week; and, from the resurrection of Christ was changed into the first day of the week, which, in Scripture, is called the Lord's-day, and is to be continued to the end of the world, as the Christian Sabbath. This Sabbath is then kept holy unto the Lord, when men, after a due preparing of their hearts, and ordering of their common affairs beforehand, do not only observe a holy rest all the day from their own works, words, and thoughts, about their worldly employments and recreations; but also are taken up the whole time in the public and private exercises of his worship, and in the duties of necessity and mercy.'

The subject we have been considering is important, not merely as regards individuals, and families, and churches, but also as regards civil communities. If it be of moment to maintain religion in the land, it must be of moment to maintain due reverence for the Sabbath, it being a fact of undeniable notoriety that respect for this institution has ever been inseparably connected with the "righteousness that exalteth a nation"—while, on the other hand, disregard of the Sabbath has been the invariable token of the spread of profligacy and irreligion. That the conduct of a nation on this point has a most influential bearing on its prosperity, will probably be conceded by all who believe in the scriptural doctrine of Providence, and regard God's promises and threatenings to ancient Israel as indicating at least the general disposition of the Divine mind on the subject. Of the many Scriptures teaching this, we may refer as

examples to one promise, and one declaration of wrath. In a passage already quoted, blessings of an exalted character are connected with the proper observance of the Sabbath. "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words. Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Isa. lv. 13, 14. An instance of the connexion between Sabbath profanation and national judgments may be found, Neh. xiii. 17, 18, "Then I contended with the nobles of Judah, and said unto them, What evil thing is this that ye do, and profane the Sabbath day? Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us, and upon this city? yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath." As a principle of national retribution does unquestionably regulate certain of the dealings of Providence, it is deeply interesting to us, not only as individuals but as Christian patriots, to enquire what is the practice of the mass of the nation of which we form a part, as regards the observance of the Sabbath.

In pursuing this inquiry, let me first turn your attention to the state of London, partly because, as the seat of government, the great heart of the empire, it is entitled to our primary notice, and also because we have evidence with regard to the way in which the Sabbath is passed there, more circumstantial and definite than we are in possession of as to many minor places: and the concurrent declarations of all who have written on the subject testify to the existence of a tremendous amount of Sabbath profanation in that great capital. Mr. Harris, (the admirable author of 'Mammon,') has given the following graphic and powerful

description of it, in a sermon recently preached in aid of the London City Mission; after dwelling on the extent of vice and immorality exhibited during the week, he continues:—"But does not the return of the Sabbath form an exception to this state? It does—but an exception of the most fearful kind—for it consists in their state, then, being aggravated tenfold: 650,000 human beings then stand up and say in the face of heaven, '*there shall be no Sabbath*'—as far as the scriptural observance of the day is concerned, there shall be no Sabbath, we will rest from our ordinary labour only to toil in sin—the day shall be set apart to evil.' And in obedience to this fearful decree, issued as from the throne of wickedness, the temples of vice are early thrown open, and thronged with impious devotees; the press issues its weekly manual of slander and sedition, impurity and blasphemy; every minister of evil is then in full employ, aided by numerous helpers called in for the occasion; in many districts the ordinary market is quickened into the bustle and riot of a fair; the quiet of the week is broken up by the carnival of the Sabbath; the great volcano of iniquity heaves and rises, and discharges its desolating contents into the country for miles around; every available form of art is pressed into the service of sin; the whole satanic system of depravity is in active and universal operation; and vice holds its saturnalia. Such is their *Sabbath* state."*

The unexaggerated truth of this striking description is abundantly attested by the evidence given before the select committee of the House of Commons, appointed, a few years since, to enquire into the observance of the Sabbath day, and by the testimony of various other respectable witnesses; if, indeed, it be not supererogatory to adduce proofs of what is of public and unquestionable notoriety. There are labourers and artisans who, having been paid their wages on Saturday night, must do their marketing on

* Christian Citizen, pp. 24, 25.

Sunday, and have every facility for it, by the numbers of shops of all kinds, which are ostentatiously open. There are numbers of journeymen bakers, who, after having laboured for fourteen hours every day during the week, must toil seven more upon the Sabbath. Barges are coming up the river with merchandize, drovers are guiding their cattle to Smithfield, and porters are hurrying through the town with parcels brought by the morning coaches and waggons. Twenty-six Sunday newspapers, in the production of which many printers and others have worked during the night, are being circulated, to the extent of about 40,000 copies, by various news-venders and hawkers. Even within the places of worship are busy note-takers, writing down the discourses delivered there, in order to publish them for their own pecuniary profit, however much their doing so may be against the will of the preachers; thus adding moral dishonesty to Sabbath profanation, and (so far as they are concerned) literally making the house of prayer a den of thieves. The tea-gardens of the suburbs are open for the amusement of the lovers of pleasure, and are visited by such numbers, that 2,500 persons have been observed on a single Sunday evening, to enter the gardens of White Conduit House alone. A number of short stage-coaches and steam-boats are conveying pleasure parties to various scenes of amusement in the suburbs, and the roads and the river present, instead of the stillness of the Sabbath, the noise and levity of a race-course or a fair. 'Meanwhile, enough of Sabbath breaking remains within the metropolis. Noble and fashionable Sabbath-breakers, by thousands, are shewing, in the unspeakably insipid procession of gay equipages in Hyde Park, how well they can employ the bounties of God to insult him by their ostentatious violation of his express command. Then, when they have languished through the wearisome monotony of the holy day, they achieve at night—by luxurious banqueting, by gatherings of the beautiful and the gay, by the splendour

of illumination, by music and song, an atheistical forgetfulness of God—shake off, for a moment, the *ennui* of fashionable existence, or disburden themselves of the annoyance of conscience—while, as another valuable end to refresh the memory on a dying bed, they effect the destruction of thousands of their unhappy dependents, who are sauntering at the doors of public houses, while in attendance on their midnight revels. The poorer classes are not slow to follow their wholesome example. From six o'clock in the morning to the hour of public prayer, the public houses and the gin shops are open to their customers, and there crowds are consuming in early debauch the gains of the week. Evening renews the revel, and the Bacchanalian orgies of the poor rise up before God in harmonious alliance with the less gross, but not less ungodly, festivities of the rich.'*

The awful amount of Sabbath profanation here exhibited to our view, is unhappily but too much augmented through the kingdom by practices, varying indeed according to local circumstances, but all manifesting the same determination to follow worldly gain, or worldly pleasure, in utter disregard of the sanctity of God's holy day. For instance, would any more than the alteration of a few unessential particulars be necessary in order to adapt the descriptions I have brought forward to the state of our own city? Do not drunkenness and riot stalk through our streets on the Sabbath? Are not the Christian's eyes every where insulted by those who are buying, and selling, and getting gain? Are there not within doors feasting and voluptuous indulgence, and without, idleness and profligacy? Are not cars, and hackney coaches, and stage coaches, and steam coaches, and private carriages in continual motion from dawn to midnight, forwarding the amusements of those who are "lovers of pleasure more than lovers of

* Letter on the state of the Metropolis, by the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel.

God?" Wherever you turn, do you not meet individuals and groups upon whose very countenances the mind's eye can see the word 'Sabbath-breaker' stamped as visibly as was the brand upon the brow of Cain? Here, a news-room gathers in its listless loungers; there, a circus contains its hundreds assembled to quaff the intoxicating cup of political excitement. Rich and poor, young and old, the titled and the obscure, in various modes, more or less gross according to their tastes or circumstances, throng with their contributions to swell the mountain mass of iniquity that rises up in daring defiance before the face of high heaven. And when we call to mind that in the other large towns of the kingdom similar scenes are presented, and that the country parts exhibit their own equally unequivocal forms of desecration, we are constrained to acquiesce in the declaration of the parliamentary committee, that "there is a systematic and widely spread violation of the Lord's day, which cannot fail to be highly injurious to the best interests of the people, and which is calculated to *bring down upon the country the Divine displeasure.*" Were Sabbath profanation the *only* sin of which as a nation we are guilty—and, may the God of mercy look with compassion on us! it is far from being so—still, should we not hear and tremble at the voice which cries, "Shall I not visit for these things? saith the Lord: shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?" (Jer. v. 29.)

Under such circumstances, while it behoves each to look to himself in the first instance, and to take heed that his own hands be clean from such guilt, it is also an inquiry of deep and urgent interest, 'What are the means by which the evil may be prevented or at least lessened?' Now, there can be no hesitation in replying, that the great mean of eradicating all vice is, the diffusion of scriptural godliness through the land; and therefore every instrumentality which is calculated to lead men to the saving knowledge of Christ, is necessarily calculated to promote the observance

of the Lord's day. But seeing that multitudes continue in the love and practice of sin, notwithstanding all the efforts made to reclaim them, is it competent for the legislature of the country to interfere, and by its authority guard the Sabbath from, at least, open violation? That it was so, the wisdom of our ancestors concluded, and various laws based on the recognition of this principle exist upon our statute book, however little they may have been attended to or enforced. Amongst the results of that happy awakening which has recently taken place in the mind of the religious public on this subject, one has been the presentation to the legislature of a number of petitions praying for the enactment of additional laws to restrain the abounding wickedness; and, without pledging ourselves to defend every detail of the measures proposed, or to maintain that the bills which were introduced were so perfect as that no amendment could be made by increased information and more mature deliberation on the subject, we yet have no hesitation in asserting, that the few devoted men who contended for a fuller recognition of the authority of God's law by the rulers of the land, are entitled to the admiration and gratitude of the country; and that the ridicule with which they were assailed within the walls of parliament, and by the infidel press without, was disgraceful to a country calling itself Christian, and exhibited more strikingly than perhaps any other sign of the times, the existence in some quarters of a spirit akin to that which, in a neighbouring country, once led to the decree that there should be no Sabbath, as the concomitant (no doubt the very appropriate concomitant) of the resolutions that there is no God, and that death is an eternal sleep. National feeling can never be healthy when the law of heaven is not acknowledged as the supreme authority. If the observance of the Sabbath be a moral duty incumbent on the subject, the exercise of the civil power, if necessary, to protect him in this observance, is a moral duty equally incumbent on the

ruler. When Nehemiah set himself to remedy the evils which impeded the prosperity of Jerusalem, his attention was soon attracted to the profanation of the Sabbath by public trading and public amusement; and we do not read that he passed it over as a religious matter in which it might be said he, as a civil ruler, had no right to interfere; nay, he contended with the nobles of Judah, sharply reproving them for having permitted the evil to grow to such magnitude, and without delay adopted active measures for its removal. There are many and great *temporal* advantages connected with the institution, which, even of themselves, would amply justify legislative protection of it; and moreover, if it be true that national prosperity bears a proportion to national religion, it is evident that the governors of a country are then best fulfilling their trust, and advancing the welfare of those over whom they preside, when they are most assiduously guarding the sacredness of the Sabbath.

Let me not be misunderstood, however, in these observations. I am well aware no human law can reach to the *spiritual* obligations of the Lord's day, nor is it possible to compel men to observe it with the internal devotion that the Searcher of hearts requires. I have no desire to see the secular arm employed to coerce men's attendance on places of worship, or an inquisitorial power exercised in entering private dwellings to scrutinize the way in which individuals or families are engaged. I would leave religion fully and freely (where, indeed, persecute as men may, it must eventually be left) between each individual's conscience, and the supreme and omniscient Judge. But there would be no infringement of religious liberty, but rather a more complete establishment of it, in such a law as would repress public profanations of the Sabbath, and extend protection to those who desire to observe it, by prohibiting all that would either legally or morally compel them to its violation. For instance, the abolition of Sunday trading would be an es-

sential portion of any efficient measure; unprincipled and irreligious men, who are withheld by no conscientious scruple from doing their ordinary work on the Lord's day, should not be permitted to interfere with the interests, or injure the business of such of their competitors in trade as are anxious to "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy;" nor should the latter be exposed to so strong a temptation to follow the example of the former. Sunday markets should be abolished; and to prevent the inconvenience that might arise from this step to the poorer classes, there might (according to the suggestion of the parliamentary committee) be some regulation for the payment of wages at an earlier period than Saturday night. A most important feature in a good bill on this subject would also be an absolute prohibition of the opening of public houses during any part of the day, however small; no observation of mine could exhibit this in a stronger light than it has been presented in an anecdote told by Mr. Cubitt, in his excellent sermon on the Sabbath. Returning home one evening from the discharge of ministerial duties, he, (Mr. C.,) was accosted by a man in a state of intoxication, who yet seemed resolved to enter into a conversation with him. He acknowledged that his conduct was wrong, and said he was continually forming resolutions of amendment. 'Many a time,' said he, 'I leave my own house on Sunday morning to go to a place of worship, but then the public houses are open;—I get past one or two, and at the door of the third, there stands perhaps an old acquaintance,—he invites me in, and then it is all over with me. I spend the money I should keep my family with, and have then to work hard all the week, and to struggle at the same time with head-ache or hunger.' His concluding words were very remarkable—they were spoken with the energy of deep feeling—he had become comparatively sober—'Oh, Sir, if the great folks want to keep

us poor folks sober, *they should shut up the traps that catch us.*' The poor man spake truly—assuredly they should. Those Monday fairs, also, which are found by experience to lead to so much travelling, and driving of cattle on the preceding Sabbath, should be changed to a later day in the week. In short all such enactments should be made as are necessary to remove hindrances from the way of observance of the Lord's day, leaving it then free to every man to walk in that path if he will. That this liberty will not be availed of in many instances, is of no weight as an argument against its being conceded; his use or abuse of the privilege is each individual's own concern, for which he is responsible, not to his fellow creatures, but to his Creator, and we are to be in no degree deterred from the suppression of Sunday trading, by the fear that those now engaged in it would afterwards continue to violate the commandment by passing the day in amusement. Moreover, to contend that the legislature is not to do what it can on this subject, because it cannot do every thing—that it is not to repress outward profanation of the Sabbath, because it cannot reach the heart, and enforce a devotional spirit there, is (as has been well said) not less absurd than it would be to maintain that a perjurer ought not to be punished, because acts of parliament cannot make men love and tell truth; nor a thief, because they cannot implant principles of probity; nor a murderer, because envy, anger, and revenge, cannot be thus subdued. Nay, let that seventh portion of his time which is every man's birthright, be secured to him; let his *property in it* be as sacredly guarded as his property in his worldly substance; and then, if he choose to squander the precious talent, or bury it in the earth, the fault will be altogether his own —he shall not be able to excuse himself by referring to a compulsion to sin, arising out of the circumstances in which the laws of his country permitted him to be placed.

As one reply, therefore, to the question, 'How is Sabbath profanation to be checked?' we say, let the friends of religion and order unite to seek from the legislature such enactments as, without coercing any man's conscience, or unduly interfering with his liberty, will prevent open and daring violations of the Lord's day, and secure to all who desire to observe it, unrestricted freedom to do so. Here is a centre at which all who know the power of religion might and ought to unite, merging minor points of difference in the vindication of this great principle. The Christian public of various denominations have extensive and powerful political influence; it ought, to its utmost compass, be brought to bear energetically and perseveringly on this subject. From each Christian congregation in the land, there should be a strong and urgent petition; and the influence of each Christian, individually, should, as circumstances admit, be exerted to direct the attention of members of parliament to the consideration of this important topic. The Wesleyan-Methodist Conferences, both in England and Ireland, have repeatedly and earnestly directed attention to this duty; and while it would be a matter of regret that our people, *as a body*, should ever identify themselves with any of the movements of mere political strife, (our connexion being formed for exclusively spiritual purposes,) it would be not only blameless, but highly desirable and laudable that they should take a prominent and vigorous part in the effort to promote the better observance of the Lord's day. Here, as in the struggle for the abolition of negro slavery, Christians should be seen in the front of the battle, and if they will only put forth their strength, they cannot fail of success.

After all, however, let the paramount importance of *moral means* be ever borne in mind. While we petition

our earthly governors to do what lies within *their* power, let us not fail unceasingly and earnestly to petition our heavenly King for the accomplishment of that which his grace alone can effect,—even such an outpouring of his spirit, as will cause an extended revival of religion, and consequently a " turning of the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just." Let us also endeavour to spread information on the subject, and in order to do this successfully, let us make ourselves acquainted with the principal arguments by which the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath may be defended, and the fallacy of those reasonings by which it is attempted to undermine its authority, made manifest. Let us not suffer sin on our families or acquaintances ; but, however painful may be the duty, let us faithfully reprove them. Let us labour to impress on our childrens' minds, from the first dawnings of intelligence, recognition of, and respect for, ' the best day in all the seven.' Let us, for ourselves individually, study the word of God with prayer for heavenly direction, that we may ascertain the extent of both our Sabbatical duties and our Sabbatical privileges, and may be stimulated to press forward to the full performance of the one, and the full enjoyment of the other ; and knowing how much more efficacious than precept is consistent *example*, while we profess anxiety to lead others to " Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy,"—O my brethren, let us see that we remember it ourselves. Let it be our effort, that by the Divine blessing, each succeeding Sabbath may leave us holier and happier than it found us ;—more exalted in affection from earth to heaven ;—better instructed in the things that pertain to our spiritual welfare ;—in the enjoyment of closer communion with the Father of our spirits ;—and more meet to " enter through the gates into that city" where, as there is " no temple"

that is, no place peculiarly set apart for one, the whole being one vast temple, pervaded and blessed by the manifested presence of God and the Lamb,—so there shall be no Sabbath in the sense in which we now employ the term, —no portion of time statedly separated from meaner uses to be appropriated to religious exercises, but all eternity shall be spent in the more elevated employments, and more exquisite pleasures of the unending "Sabbatism that remaineth for the people of God."

A

DISCOURSE

ON

DIVINE WORSHIP,

FROM JOHN IV. 24:

DELIVERED IN BALLYCLARE,

AT THE OPENING OF THE WESLEYAN-METHODIST CHAPEL,
SEPTEMBER 7, 1828,

BY

DANIEL M'AFEE.

The Profits of the Sale to be devoted to a religious purpose

BELFAST.
PRINTED BY LANKTREE & WILSON,
70, HIGH-STREET.

1829.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

DISCOURSE,

&c. &c.

"GOD IS A SPIRIT, AND THEY THAT WORSHIP HIM MUST WORSHIP HIM IN SPIRIT AND IN TRUTH."—John iv. 24.

1.—To suppose that God created man with a principle of indifference towards himself, casts a shade over the perfections and character of Heaven. It obscures the understanding, and tarnishes the goodness of the Eternal — it represents him as acting from a motive of foolish, absurd, and useless cruelty, in bringing into existence a race of intelligent agents that cannot but oppose the hand that formed them; at the same time their puny efforts of hostility are vainer than the dashing of the wave against the sublime and sturdy rock. If indifference or enmity now exist, it could neither have been original nor natural; and hence it must have taken its rise from another source than God. We have no method of accounting for the present apostacy of man, but by the revelation Deity has been pleased to bestow. By it, we are informed how sin entered into the world, veiled the invisible things of God from the understanding, and shut up man within the limited horizon of human reason and imperfect sense. God, however, saw through the cloud — beheld the wickedness of man to be great — and, to display his own perfections, punish the ungodly, and prevent a greater succession of violence and iniquity than ever has been in the world, he swept away the first race of mankind from the face of the earth, by

"A shoreless ocean, that tumbled round the globe."

2.—Not long after the flood, impiety began to assume a new form. The old inhabitants were mere atheists and libertines,

who disdained all religious worship, lived to themselves, and gratified the lusts of the flesh. The inhabitants of the new world, being warned by their punishment, adhered to the worship of God; but soon began to corrupt it by false notions relative to his mode of existence. Every error in religion commences with *modes*, and finally spreads its influence to *realities*.

3.—There is no doubt but the heavenly bodies became the first objects of religious worship, in the use of idolatry. The sun, being the most glorious object, obscure, unassisted reason would naturally fancy him to be the immediate residence of Deity. Sensible of the benefits of his light and heat, experience must soon have taught mankind that he was, in a great measure, the source of vegetation. He was seen rising in the morning, running his circle during the day, and in the evening sinking into a state of repose. Feeling the influence of his genial beam, the next step was to imagine him animated, like themselves; and thus the luminary which at first constituted the habitation of God, was soon imagined to be his body. Hence, in their untutored minds, he became a compound being, like man — partly corporeal, and partly spiritual; and such notions being imbibed, led them at once into absolute idolatry. Pure mind, separate from matter, was soon absorbed in objects of sense, and the Deity materialized, through the ignorance of man.

4.—Darkness and cold were at once perceived to be contrary to light and heat. It was natural to attribute contrary effects to different and contrary powers. Hence light was considered a benevolent principle, and the source of all good; while darkness, being directly opposed in its spirit and effects, was believed to be the fountain of all evil and malevolence. Thus darkness, in all probability, became the second god in the pagan calendar.

5.—This system is thought to have commenced in Chaldea, to have spread all over the east, to have passed into Egypt, and thence into Greece. The sun was the king — the moon the queen of heaven; and the stars, appearing, in their absence, in opposition to the principle of darkness, were soon placed on the list of divinites. The earth, as the common mother of all things; the ocean, in perpetual motion; the air, as the region of storm and tempest — in fact, every thing that indicated a principle of vitality

or was the subject of motion, were gradually inserted on the calendar of the gods.

6.—The next descent of the human mind, in the scale of degradation, was into image and statue worship. A stone or stump of a tree was fashioned into an emblem of some particular divinity, was consecrated to his service, and he was supposed to make his peculiar residence there. Pillars, altars, statues, and images, were erected on high places, to render them conspicuous, or perhaps to bring them as near as possible to the deities they represented; and hence, Moses, in Deut. xii. 1, 2. enjoins: "Ye shall utterly destroy all the places wherein the nations, which ye shall possess, served their gods, upon the *high mountains*, and upon *the hills*, and under every *green tree*; and ye shall overthrow their *altars*, and break down their *pillars*, and burn their *groves* with *fire*, and ye shall hew down the *graven images* of their *gods*, and destroy the *names* of them out of that place."

7.—The progress of this idolatry was regular, and its dominion became universal. Princes and priests soon availed themselves of its influence, and governed their subjects and votaries through the medium of superstition.

8.—To account for the immoral characters of the gentile divinities is not difficult, from the principles now advanced. The heroes and benefactors of antiquity, on account of superior excellency, were deemed the offspring of the gods, or a portion of their substance. At death, they were said to return to the god from whom they had descended. Being subject to human appetites and passions while in the body, in their state of deification they were supposed to retain the same sensual desires they had felt on earth, and to follow the same means for their gratification. Hence, Jupiter, Apollo, Mars, and the whole rabble of gods, are described by the best heathen poets, as ravishers and adulterers. Hermes or Mercury, was a thief, and the god of thieves; Venus was a prostitute; Bacchus, a drunkard; and Juno, implacable in her malice and revenge. In a word, they were

> "Gods partial, changeful, passionate, unjust—
> Whose attributes were rage, revenge, and lust."

9.—These acts clearly illustrate the assertion of the apostle, that "the world by wisdom knew not God:" they demonstrate the insufficiency of corrupted reason to find out the only object of worship—show the folly and absurdity of every human system, and discover the absolute necessity of a revelation — of the opening of the skies — of a voice from the throne of God, to direct us to himself — of light from above, to shine upon our benighted world, and chase the moral darkness of the human family from the widely-extended regions of fallen nature and depraved intellect.

10.—Let us now glorify our God. The want is supplied; the thing is done. God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son. The word was made flesh, tabernacled among us, and displayed the glory and perfections of Divinity to our view. Behold now, the ancient of days; the fulfilment of prophecy; the end of sacrifices; the completion of the law; the hope of Israel; the desire of all nations; the brightness of the Father's glory, the express image of his person, and the meridian sun of revelation! See there, at Jacob's well, Heaven itself embodied in the wearied frame of Jesus Christ, sitting, with all the infirmities of humanity, and waiting the approach of a human being. She draws near; but who is she? A woman of Samaria — an adultress; one who had had five husbands, but is now living with one who is not her husband! Does Jesus flee from the sinner? No. She is possessed of humanity; she has a soul of more value than the universe beside. Her vessel is let down into the water; the Son of Man is thirsty; he requests a drink; a conversation ensues — and soon the necessary revelation is given to the woman of Samaria. He who once said, "Let there be light, and there was light," speaks again. He, who on the fourth day of creation, gathered the subtle fluid in his hand, and compressed it into the body of the sun, to rule the day, now collects all the scattered rays of every preceding dispensation, and embodying them in our text, fixes it in the firmament of the church, in unclouded splendour, to attract our notice and direct our worship: *God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.* These words furnish us with the object, the obligations, and the true nature of religious worship. Let us then consider

I. The object of religious worship. The object is God,

and this God is a Spirit. This subject is awful and interesting. Let us pause for a moment, before we approach to contemplate this Being, even in his own sanctuary. The place of his presence is always sacred and glorious. The bush of revelation still burns with fire. The cloud of his presence, it is true, is transferred from mount Sinai to mount Zion; but even here, there is a majesty that commands our reverence, and forbids the highest intellect to draw near for the purpose of mere speculation. The high priest of the Jews, before he entered into the presence of the Lord, was commanded to wash his body in pure water — typical of the cleansing operation of the Holy Spirit; and to clothe himself in the sacred habiliments of the sanctuary — indicative of that holiness of heart and life which should adorn us in the contemplation and worship of the Most High. Let us, therefore, pursue this subject with feelings of the deepest humility, and in entire dependence on the aid of the fountain of all good. He has furnished us with the volumes of creation and revelation; and from them we may easily aduce his being and perfections. The former is but a dim reflector of his glory, compared with the latter. To the testimony and information of his word, therefore, we shall be chiefly indebted, while we adhere to the following method: — there is a God — there is a trinity of persons; and these three are one, in essence, power and glory.

1. *There is a God.* The voice of reason, creation, and revelation bears testimony to the truth of this position. His existence is the basis of all these. Every effect must have an adequate cause, and nothing cannot produce something. These are maxims, evident, undeniable, and immutable. The existence of matter demonstrates the existence of a first cause. Matter is equally indifferent to motion or rest. If it be at rest, of itself, it could never generate into motion. If it be in motion, of itself, it could never settle into rest. The fixed stars, for instance, never could retain the same relative position towards each other, were there not a sufficient agency to uphold them; and the planets revolving round the sun, never could move without an original mover. If the fixed stars, therefore, were eternal, the being who settled and supports them, must also be eternal. If the motion of the planets be eternal, there necessarily must have been a some-

thing possessing life and active power that imparted motion from eternity, and caused them to differ from the fixed stars. If matter, therefore, existed from eternity, there must have been an eternal, active, energetic mind to give it place, relative position, and motion; and this eternal intelligence, self-existing, is the being whom our text denominates God.

The eternal existence of matter, however, is absurd and actually impossible. Behold, now, in the glass of reason, the egregious folly of atheism! Be astonished that any human being could be actually so depraved and mad as to deny the existence of God, and attribute to a fortuitous organization of matter, the order, design, and harmony of the universe. If matter be eternal, all its operations, revolutions, and successive productions must exist in one infinite series of unlimited succession. All luminous bodies must have emitted an infinite number of rays. All periodical bodies in motion must have performed an infinite number of revolutions; and all species of animals, vegetables, and trees, must constitute, each a chain consisting of an infinite succession of links. Stars of unequal magnitude must have emitted an equal number of rays, because both being eternal are infinite. The dog star Sirius, having existed from eternity, had scattered as many particles of light throughout the universe, a million of ages ago, as he has done up to the present period. The earth goes round the sun in 365 days, and during that time, the moon revolves 12 times round the earth, and yet, according to atheism, the number of revolutions in both courses must be equal, because both are infinite, being from eternity. There is now an infinite succession of trees, and the number being infinite, there could not have been more branches than trees, nor more leaves than branches. According to the reasoning of atheists, there is now an infinite succession of men—the number is infinite now, and the succession being from eternity, it was infinite before the time of Alexander the great; and yet, in their arithmetic, both numbers must be equal, because each is infinite; of course the number of their hands must be equal to the number of their bodies, and the number of their fingers equal to the number of their hands; while the combined number of the hairs on all their heads, is equal to the number of their heads! Such is atheism, that first-born child of chaos, confusion, and ab-

solute absurdity! It repels us into the belief of a first intelligent cause, and though finite reason cannot comprehend him, yet of his existence, there is the same evidence that we ourselves exist.

There is a God. The order, harmony, magnificence, and design displayed in the creation, declare it. The magnitude, motion, and regularity of the heavenly bodies — the succession of day and night — the return of summer and winter, seed time and harvest; the exquisite variety and beauty of the vegetable kingdom; the the mysterious organization of animal life; the construction of the human frame; the circulation of the blood; and, finally, the extraordinary phenomenon of human intellect, capable of receiving, comparing and arranging an endless variety of ideas; — all inspire a conviction of a first, an efficient, and an intelligent cause. In the contemplation of his mere existence, however, we are not to stop. Our text leads us to the consideration of his nature and perfections, and in this pursuit supplies us with more information than could be culled from the annals of philosophy or the archives of antiquity. God is a Spirit: of whom we may proceed to observe:

(1) He is an *immaterial essence, nature, or being.* He is a substance, distinct from all others that exist, or possibly can exist. He is without body, parts or passions. He is pure intellect itself, free from all mortal mixture or composition. His being is purely abstract and distinct from whatever is possible or capable of suffering. There is no known property of matter applicable to spirit of any kind, much less to him, who is the Father of spirits. Figure, solidity, impenetrability, colour, and gravitation, are no properties of his nature. He is immaterial, incorruptible, invisible, and incapable of being divided, or impaired by any force whatever. God is an immense, intelligent mind — self-active, self-moving, self existent, and wholly above the perception of bodily sense: free from all the imperfections and infirmities of corporeal beings; and absolutely distinct, in the transcendent excellency of his nature, from every created spirit.

When he ascribes to himself any of the parts or members of humanity, it is only by way of metaphor, in condescension to our understanding. In the Scriptures, his eyes and ears denote his omniscience; his feet, the ubiquity of his presence; his face, the

favour he shows; his mouth, the manifestation of his will; his nostrils, the acceptation of our offerings; his bowels, the tenderness of his compassion; his heart, the sincerity of his love; and his hand, the strength and greatness of his power. But all these are merely figurative of the perfections and operations of a Being whom sense cannot perceive, reason comprehend, or human speech declare.

Our text teaches us also to distinguish between the *essential* and *majestic* presence of God. His essential presence is infinite, and can neither be localized nor seen. Hence, he is styled the invisible God, whom no eye hath seen, nor can see; and to Moses he declared, no man can see my face and live. But his majestic, is the notification of his essential presence, in some determinate space. Thus he is said to clothe himself with light, as with a garment; to dwell in unapproachable light, as in a place or habitation. So the Lord abode upon mount Sinai, and the cloud covered it six days, and the sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire on the top of the mount, in the eyes of the children of Israel. His essential presence is said to dwell bodily or substantially in the man Christ Jesus, who displayed the majesty of his Godhead upon mount Tabor, and now manifests it in the kingdom above, as the glory which he had with the Father before the world was.

In the declaration of Jesus, *God is a Spirit*, we learn also why the Godhead is not to be likened to *silver*, *gold*, or *stone graven by art*, or *man's device*. Because *God is a Spirit*, we are not to make unto ourselves, *any graven image*, nor *the likeness* of *any thing*, in the *heavens above*, nor in the *earth beneath*. This would corrupt our notions of him, and tend to sensualize the mind. To whom, then, shall we liken God, or to what likeness shall we compare him? Traverse the immensity of space, examine every planet and star, survey the surface of the earth, dig down into its bowels; and, after ransacking universal nature, nothing can be found like unto him who is a Spirit, infinitely separated from all material existence.

(2) The being whom we adore is *eternal*. There was no period in which he began to be, or in which he did not exist. He styles himself the *Alpha and Omega*, *the first and the last*, *which is, and*

which was, and which is to come. Bounddless duration, without beginning, and that cannot possibly end, is the only measure of his existence. *From everlasting to everlasting,* saith the Psalmist, *thou art God. He is the high and lofty one who inhabiteth eternity, with whom one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.* To him there is no fleeting succession of days, and weeks, and months, and years. He tends not from the past to the present, nor from the present to the future; but, comprehending all periods in his own being, gathers the extremities of eternity into his own existence, and compresses all into one perpetual now. He lives, and actually *is,* not *will be,* alive for evermore. As he is absolute life, essential being, or simple existence itself; he can never desire a cessation of his being. He cannot desert existence, because this would be fleeing from himself. He can have no tendency to dissolution in his nature, because he is not composed of parts, Nothing foreign to himself can infringe on his existence, because he stretches beyond every thing that possibly can exist, and all things depend on him for being. His life is self-existent, necessary, and eternal; and as he exists from everlasting to everlasting, there is no vacuum in duration into which he could retire; and so can never cease to be.

In the eternity of Jehovah let the righteous rejoice; because he lives they shall live also. Let them put their trust in him, and in nothing which he has made. Let them cease from man, whose breath is in his nostrils; for wherein is he to be accounted of? The wicked also should hear, and fear, and turn to the Lord. An eternal being is capable of inflicting everlasting punishment. They are the enemies of his government, of his throne, and of his existence. The principle of enmity unsubdued would exterminate the very being of God. Some have done this, in imagination, by a denial of what necessarily exists and never can cease to be.

(3) The object of our adoration is *omnipresent* — he exists *every where.* The woman, in conversing with our Lord, hints at the locality of the divine presence: "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; but ye say that Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship." The same ignorance and prejudice actuate the minds of men to this hour. The corrupt heart is still prone to confine the Deity to temples made with hands. Christ has taught the

Christian better. When we pray that God may be present in this or that place, we should recollect that this can only mean an extraordinary manifestation of his favour. God displays his *gracious presence* in the closet, or in the house erected to his honour; and his *majestic presence* in the courts of glory: but the *essential presence* of Jehovah, which fills immensity, constitutes his boundless greatness, and is the same

"In the void waste as in the city full."

Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? saith the Lord. Do not I fill heaven and earth? Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there: if I take the wings of the morning and flee to the uttermost parts of the earth, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand hold me. In him we live, and move, and have our being. He it is who environs all existence, penetrates every substance, spreads undivided, and replenishes immensity with his presence. Eternity is his palace; universal space his temple; earth, ocean, and skies his altars, where intelligent beings present the sacrifices of humble love and ardent devotion.

This immensity of the Eternal is to be admired, compared to which the earth is but a point, the ocean a drop, the heavens an expanded vapour, and the universe itself an atom. It is also to be dreaded. The presence of God necessarily surrounds us. There is no possibility of casting ourselves beyond its limits. We may well fancy a new centre in the compass of his being; but no effort of imagination can give it a circumference. We can no more flee from it than we can from the horizon that surrounds us. Every step we take gives us a new centre and a new horizon, that necessarily leaves us at the same distance from its margin — a striking emblem indeed of the essential presence and immensity of God! Let us learn, then, to fear him who cannot hide his presence from us, and from whom we try, in vain, to retire into the most secret place.

(4) The object of our adoration is *omniscient:* he knows all things. This attribute is essentially connected with his eternity

and immensity. As he existed from eternity, he must have been conscious of his own being and perfections. As he exists every where, his knowledge must necessarily be commensurate with his being. The highest object of the Divine Being's knowledge must be his own nature and attributes. For God to know himself, implies unbounded skill. It embraces the eternity of his existence, the immensity of his presence, the spirituality of his nature, his purity, rectitude, and boundless goodness; with the infinite range of possibilities that lie within the compass of omnipotence. Need we marvel, then, that it comprehends, at one survey, the wide empire of existence, and discovers the essence and operations of all finite things. He whose knowledge extends to infinity cannot possibly be ignorant of any thing limited within the sphere of his own being. All things past must be known to him, because he still lives in the past; all things present are equally under his inspection, because he is every where: and all things future necessarily must be apprehended by him who dwells in eternity. He knew, from everlasting, that, in time, he would reward Abraham's obedience, and punish the iniquity of Sodom. This was but foreknowing his own future acts; and yet these acts are intimately connected with the free-agency of man. Let us grant that God knows himself and all his own future operations, and we may easily perceive, at once, that he must foreknow the actions of free intelligencies, as they are so intimately connected with what he himself will do. This knowledge is to us incomprehensible. Well might the apostle say, "Known unto God are all his works, from the beginning." All things are naked and open unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do. O Lord! thou hast searched me and known me; thou knowest my down-sitting and my up-rising; thou understandest my thoughts afar off; thou compassest my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways; for there is not a word in my tongue, but lo, O Lord, thou knowest it altogether. Thou hast beset me behind and before, and laid thine hand upon me. Such knowledge is too high for me — I cannot attain unto it. If I say, surely the darkness shall cover me, even the night shall be light about me: yea, the darkness hideth not from thee, but the night shineth as the day — the darkness and the light are both alike to thee. My substance was not hid from the

when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being imperfect, and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned when as yet there were none of them.

This attribute of the divine nature commands our highest veneration. The most capacious understanding is but as a glow-worm, compared to this fountain of light and knowledge. If we admire a human taper, that sheds an imperfect glare of derived and partial rays of knowledge, how should we adore the Father of lights, with whom is no darkness or ignorance whatever? Let the consideration of "Thou God seest me," inspire us with humility and watchfulness. Let the blaze of his all-seeing eye burn up every impure motive and religious mask in his service. To him all acts of concealment are vain, and the thickest disguise perfectly transparent. The light and the darkness are both alike to him; and hence, sincerity and truth should mingle with all our attempts to worship the God of wisdom and unbounded knowledge.

(5) The being whom we worship is *omnipotent*. He is infinitely powerful, or capable of doing all things. As the notion of power is merely relative, so we can form no adequate conception of the power of any agent but by the effects it produces. Power is the inherent energy of mind resulting in volition; and the *omnipotence* of God is the inherent energy of his infinite and eternal mind, and includes a power or capability of doing all things that can be done. "His eternal power and Godhead," saith the apostle, "are made manifest by the things which he has made." Survey the solar system, and reflect on the universe, and then form your notions of the immense power of God. The earth on which we tread is nearly 7964 miles in diameter, and about 25,000 in circumference. Here is a vast mass of matter, rolling in its orbit and turning on its axis every 24 hours. Its mean distance from the sun is about 95 millions of miles, and it travels perpetually around him at the amazing rate of 68,000 miles per hour! Thus, we have the phenomena of day and night, of spring and autumn, summer and winter. Think upon the continual flux and reflux of the tide; the ascending of the vapour from the surface of the sea; the perpetual formation of the clouds; the descent of rain; the distillation of dew; the process of vegetation; the succession

and support of animal life; the diversity of the human countenance; the variety of flowers, plants, and trees that adorn the earth; the high mountains rising from its surface; and the atmosphere hanging loosely around the whole, like a tenuous robe, through which the rays of light are refracted, and, being buoyed around in every direction, constitutes the light of day. Contemplate the grandeur of the scene, where sky and ocean seem to meet; turn your eyes to the lofty arch of heaven, and behold it decked with innumerable stars — centres of other systems, that roll, in grand succession, through the pathless fields of space. Think how the sun, nearly one million four hundred thousand times larger than the earth, is suspended in the centre of the solar system, as the source of light and heat to the planets; and thus learn to elevate the mind to him whose *word* bade them *be*, whose *finger* guides their *motions*, and whose *power* preserves their being. Truly such power is boundless, irresistable, and subject to no limitation whatever, except by the perfections of that nature in which it inheres. From it all finite power is derived, is subordinate to it, and dependent on it. It infinitely transcends the united energy of all finite being. Nothing can oppose, check, or control its influence; and it is capable of bearing down and annihilating all other power in the empire of existence in an instance, with the most perfect ease. It is an attribute of the divine nature, which commands the fear, the confidence, and the adoration of mortals who dwell in houses of clay. Our natural fear remits us to the God of power, as its ultimate object. He it is who is able to kill the body, and afterward can cast both body and soul into hell. If he be our friend, then, whom shall we fear? Though an host encamp against us, he will be the strength of our life, our shield and buckler — for in the Lord Jehovah there is everlasting strength.

(6) The object of our worship is possessed of *every moral perfection*, together with the natural ones we have now adduced. He proclaims himself "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful, gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin." Would we have a complete view of his character, and the simplest apprehension of his very essence that infinite wisdom can possibly communicate to finite minds? — Hear, O heavens! and give ear,

O earth! while it is revealed from heaven, in a trinity of words. GOD IS LOVE! This is a literal declaration of the nature of him whom our Lord presents before us as an eternal, omnipresent, omniscient, and omnipotent spirit. These are but the attributes of divine and superlative love. Love is eternal, immense, all-seeing, and infinitely powerful. All works of creation, providence, and redemption, are but the products of almighty love. Every perfection of God's nature is resolvable into this.

What is divine goodness and benevolence, but the propension and tendency of love to make all his creatures happy, according to their forms, natures, and capacities? What is his mercy, but the display of love to the miserable? What is his pity, but the commiseration of love to the distressed? What is his grace, but the exercise of love's favour to the unworthy? What is his veracity or truth, but the eternal conformity of love to its own perfections and the reality of things; inclining God to express the real intentions of his mind to his intelligent offspring, and to fulfil every promise and declaration that spring from love? What is his holiness, but the eternal purity and perfection of boundless love, rising infinitely in opposition to malice, hatred, envy, revenge, pride, falsehood, cruelty, and injustice? What is his justice, but the eternal rectitude of love; ordering and disposing all things according to infinite wisdom, and distributing, with the utmost axactness and impartiality, what is due to every moral agent, according to his conformity, or nonconformity to the love and goodness of God? And what is even his wrath, or anger, but the jealousy of love, the natural displeasure of goodness, or the necessary result of favours abused? Thus, to use the language of Faringdon, "God is good, nor can any evil proceed from him. If he be angry, we have provoked him; if he come in a tempest, we have raised it; if he be a consuming fire, we have kindled it; we force him to be what he would not be; we make him thunder, who is all light."

(7) This God, whose perfections we are contemplating, is *immutable*. This is included in the identity of his nature, and the character of his every perfection. He always was, is, and will be the same. His essence is eternal, incorruptible, and immortal. His spirituality cannot be changed into matter, because it is simple

and uncompounded. His eternity cannot be resolved into time, because it is incapable of succession. His omnipresence cannot be limited in any given space, because it is boundless. His omniscience never can know less, because he is eternal and exists every where. His omnipotence never can be less powerful, because there is nothing foreign to himself capable of limiting its operations. His goodness, mercy, pity, truth, holiness, justice and anger, never can vary from their proper objects, while love is his essence, and remains capable of attraction and repulsion. All his designs, purposes, and decrees stand fast as the eternity of his existence. He immutably loves righteousness and hates iniquity. This is the necessary result of all his attributes. He cannot but love himself, as he is possessed of all excellence, without imperfection: and he cannot but dislike all iniquity, because it is unlike himself. It is vain and impossible either to impose upon or alter this omniscient, and immutable, and holy Lord God. "He is without variableness or shadow of turning." Man, through weakness or vanity, may change in his natural constitution; through ignorance, infirmity, or design, he may alter his moral purposes, break his promises, act a deceitful part, and all the glory of his graces and character may fade, like the flower of the field; but God remains everlastingly the same, and is subject to no fickleness, inconstancy, or languishing decay. The thrones of kings may tremble, empires dissolve, monarchs fall, to rise no more; seed-time and harvest, summer and winter, may cease; the last man may look on the expiring sun, the planets rush in wild confusion, the stars flicker and expire in the heavens, the elements dissolve, the pillars of the universe tremble and remove, and angels may gaze on nature's funeral pyre, while the stream of time is about to be ingulfed in the vast ocean of eternity; but the everlasting God, when nature sinks in years, shall necessarily remain the same, in the unfading splendor of all his attributes and excellencies. Such, then, is the glorious object of our worship — such is the God of nature and of revelation; and that we may apprehend him completely as he is, and not entertain false notions of his being, it is necessary to observe,

2. *That in this adorable Being, or Godhead, there is a Trinity of persons.* This is a matter of pure revelation, and can only be

decided by the authority of God himself. The divine Being knows our nature; we cannot comprehend his. Human reason is here to manifest its temperance, and bow to authority, without curious and anxious solicitude. That something existed from eternity, reason is constrained to acknowledge; and yet that Being is not older now, than he was a million of ages ago. This we cannot comprehend. That God created all things out of nothing, we are necessitated to confess, from the many absurdities flowing from the denial of the position; and why is it harder to believe that the divine essence, in a manner inconceivable to us, did, from everlasting, emanate and flow into three social and co-eternal subsistencies? We are unacquainted with the essence of any one finite thing, and hence it is no wonder we cannot comprehend that which is infinite. Let me now state before you the scriptural evidence for this doctrine, that you may rightly apprehend and worship the God of revelation.

The doctrine of a plurality in the Godhead, is intimated in the opening sentence of the book of Genesis. In the Hebrew phrase, *Elohim bara*, God created, — *Elohim* is a *plural noun*, and *Bara* a *singular verb*. Moses here represents the energy and volition of a plurality, as concurring in one effect. The following language is no less extraordinary than that now adduced: — "Let US make man" — "The man has become as ONE of US" — "Let US go down and confound their language:" also, "I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, whom shall I send, and who will go for US?" These are but a few instances of the plural form. Many more could be produced from the Hebrew scriptures, in which the word ELOHIM is joined with verbs, adjectives, and pronouns, *plural*. In these instances the grammatical construction is preserved, while in the phrase *Elohim bara*, it is not. Either form of construction, however, strongly indicates a plurality in the divine essence. To this I know it is objected, that God only speaks after the manner of emperors and kings, in their decrees. But to this futile objection it may be fairly replied: — 1, That God is spoken *of* by Moses and others, in this manner, as in the phrase *Elohim bara*. What historian ever attempted to speak of an emperor or king in this way, as to say, in allusion to one person, *they spake*, or *they did*, &c.? 2, Jehovah, on mount Sanai, where he might have

spoken as the king of Jeshurun, in delivering his law, spoke in the first person *singular*, and *not* in the *plural*. *I* am the Lord thy God, was the preface to his law — not according to the phraseology of modern princes. So the language of our Lord on the mount was — *I* say unto you. 3, God spoke neither to angel nor man when he said — "Let US make man in OUR image, after OUR likeness." Here is language indeed the most extraordinary. A plural noun is used to express the name of God. This God speaks, and the terms are US and OUR; and yet in this plurality there is but *one* image, and man is to be made in this *image*, not images of the mysterious plurality. Here there is a *diversity* and *unity* plainly expressed, which, however we are incapable of comprehending, we are bound to receive, because it is the declaration of him who cannot deceive his creatures. It it time now, however, to pass on to the New Testament, and learn what is there recorded on this singular and important subject.

That the Holy Scriptures limit this plurality to three persons, and mention them in the most distinct and eminent manner, is evident, from the following passages: — "The *Holy Ghost*, shall come upon thee, and the power of the *Highest* shall overshadow thee; therefore, also that *holy thing* which shall be born of thee shall be called the *Son of God*." Here the Holy Ghost, the Highest, and the Son of God, are distinctly mentioned. Again, "I will pray the *Father*, and he will send you another *comforter*, even the *Spirit* of truth; and when the *comforter* is come, whom *I* will send unto you from the *Father*, even the *Spirit* of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of *me*." Here are manifestly different offices, acts, and persons. The *Son* prays, send the Spirit from the Father, and is the subject of testimony. The *Father* hears, and grants the Spirit, which proceeds from himself. The *Spirit* is given, is sent, testifies of the Son, and abides as a comforter. Again, "If the *Spirit* of *him*, (of God,) that raised up *Christ* from the dead dwell in you." Here is a trinity of persons distinctly enumerated. Again, "there are diversities of gifts, but the same *Spirit* (or third person); there are differences of administration, but the same *Lord* (or second person); and there are diversities of operations, but the same *God* (or first person) that worketh all in all." Again, the apostle prays — "Now

God himself, even our Father, and the *Lord Jesus Christ* direct our ways unto you, and the *Lord* (or Holy Ghost) make you to increase and abound in love one towards another." Again, "Through the *Son*," saith the apostle, "we have access by one *Spirit* unto the *Father*." Again, saith Peter, "We are elect, according to the foreknowledge of *God* the *Father*, through sanctification of the *Spirit*, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of *Jesus Christ*." Saint John says expressly, "There are three that bear record in heaven — the *Father*, the *Word*, and the *Holy Ghost*, and these three (persons) are one (God.)" And, to sum up the whole, when *Jesus* was baptized, the *Spirit* of *God* descended like a dove, and rested on him; and a voice from heaven declared, "this is my beloved Son." And, in addition to this, when our Lord sent forth his apostles to put down the sin and iniquity of the gentile world, they were to "baptize them in the *name* of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost*;" while we, guided by apostolic example, dismiss our assemblies by using the language of Paul—"The grace of our *Lord Jesus Christ*, and the love of *God*, and the fellowship of the *Holy Ghost* be with you all." Thus we are taught, by the current testimony of revelation, both in the Old and New Testaments — by the voice of God, from heaven — by the sacred institution of baptism — and by every act of true worship, to inculcate the doctrine of the Trinity, and to keep up a recollection of the mysterious mode of his subsistence. In relation to the object of our worship, I observe:

3. *That these three persons are one God.* Thus Moses declares "the Lord our God is *one* Lord," or Jehovah; "I, even I, am the Lord, and besides me there is no other." In the Holy Scriptures, unity invariably relates to the essence, equality to the personality, and diversity and inferiority to the offices which are assumed for the purposes of redemption. We have no method of knowing any thing of the Godhead, but by what he is pleased to reveal; and it is more becoming the majesty and authority of God to command the implicit assent of the understanding, than to stoop to gratify our curiosity by an explication of modes. On this principle, the evidence of equality in the blessed trinity of persons, is profusely scattered throughout the compass of revelation; and we are left to deduce it from names, titles, declarations, and acts, as an ex-

ercise of our reason and an object of our faith. In no one place of Scripture is Christ, or the Holy Ghost, said not to be God; and in several parts their Godhead is declared. We are then to abide by express declarations, and not to contradict the Most High God, as if we were better acquainted with his mode of subsistence than he is himself. This would be the very essence of infidelity. One declaration, therefore, of God, on such a subject as this, should have more weight with a truly rational mind than all the metaphysics and philosophy in the world. Hear then what St. John saith — "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God." Is this enough? Hear then what Christ saith — "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last." If he be the first, then there was none before him, and if he be the last, there can be none after him: he is both; and hence even now he inhabiteth eternity. Hear what Jehovah himself saith, when he bringeth his first-begotten into the world — "And let all the angels of God worship him." To worship God, is to ascribe to him the glory of his being and perfections — "I am the Lord," (or Jehovah, the self-existent being) "that is my name; and my glory will I not give to *another*." Yet he commands even angels to give that glory to the Son, which demonstrates that the Son is a person in the Lord Jehovah. Is the testimony of an inspired apostle of Christ himself and of the Lord Jehovah, sufficient? Surely to every humble mind and believing heart it must be so.

The divinity of the Holy Ghost is no less evident than that of Christ or of the Father. As God is a Spirit, so he is eminently styled "the Spirit of God," and "the Spirit of holiness." Omniscience is ascribed to him by the apostle, when he saith, that "he searcheth all things; yea the deep things of God." If he searches all things, he must be acquainted with all things. Omnipresence is expressly attributed to him by the Psalmist — "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?" while he is termed by the apostle, the "eternal Spirit." He it is who moved on the face of the waters, who garnished the heavens, who wrought miracles, who creates us anew, and who receives equal worship with the Father and the Son: for as the sacrament of baptism, and the solemn benediction of the apostle, are solemn acts of worship, so

the Holy Spirit is worshipped and glorified, world without end. Well might Peter then say to Annanias — "Why hath Satan put it into their hearts to lie unto the Holy Ghost? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God."

From, these testimonies it is manifest that "the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet there are not three Gods, but one God." Such, then, is the God of revelation — the God of the Christians; a spirit eternal, immense, all-seeing, all-powerful, holy, just, merciful, kind and good, immutable in all his perfections and designs, subsisting from eternity in a trinity of subsistencies, and revealing himself in the creation, government, and redemption of the world, as the one only, living, and true God. Such is the being declared to us, in the words of our text. — "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." We now come to consider

II. The obligations of rational beings to worship God. This is a most important part of our subject, and we must endeavour both to understand and enforce it. Are we bound to worship God — the God of revelation? If there be no moral obligation, of course we may attend to it or not, as we please. If there be, it is impossible for us to free ourselves from its claims, without becoming the subject of heaven's highest displeasure. Let us then consider the source of this authority, and examine the foundation of the imperative, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Or let us resolve this into a query — Why are intelligent beings such as men, morally constrained to obey this injunction of the Most High, on pain of everlasting death? To answer this, we may observe:

1. That the *existence*, *perfection*, and *excellency* of God, render him the *fittest* and *most glorious object* of *contemplation*, *veneration*, and *worship* that we can conceive, or of which we have any knowledge; but still, if he stood to us in no other relation than that of an object possessing infinite excellencies, we could not, even from this, deduce the obligation to worship him, and him alone. This will appear evident, if we analyze the several notions of his being and perfections which we have conceived, and try to deduce from any or all of them the notion of moral obligation.

From the *mere existence* of God, it is impossible to infer our obligations to worship him; for, if we knew nothing more of him than, that he does exist, we might conclude that his existence is nothing to us — that he cares nothing for us — and that we are bound to worship any other object as readily as him, simply because it does exist. That his existence is *eternal*, or that he *existed from eternity*, does not lay the foundation, *merely of itself*, of moral obligation on our part, to worship and glorify him; for, suppose we believed in the eternity of matter, as some of the ancient philosophers did, then, on the principle of priority of existence, or existence from eternity, having a right to our worship, we should be bound to adore every thing which participates in the properties of matter. Neither from the *immateriality* or *spirituality* of God's nature, can we deduce our obligation to obey him; for, if immaterial or spiritual essence claims the worship of intelligent beings, simply because it is so, then we should be bound to worship angels, the spirits of departed men, and even our own species; because all these possess a nature of this kind. Does it take its rise from the *immensity* or *omnipresence* of God? Then, if the *mere presence* of an object constitutes a *right* to our worship, every thing in being from which we cannot remove ourselves, participates in the claim. So that the presence of matter, of spirit, and, finally, the immensity of space, might also become objects of our worship. God is *omnipotent;* he can do all things within the range of possibility; but from this *infinite* and *eternal power*, abstractedly in itself, can we infer his right to command, and oblige us to the performance of his will, simply because he is thus powerful, and capable of inflicting eternal pain, in case of disobedience? If God were destitute of this power, it is manifest, at once, that he never could possess the *right* of demanding our obedience, because, in this case, he must have been incapable of laying the foundation on which it rests; but, as the *possession* and the *exercise* of physical energy or power, involve two distinct notions, we can never infer that the mere possession thereof constitutes the ground on which he demands our highest worship and obedience. If mere might in itself constitutes the right of dominion and obedience, then it follows that whatever agent possesses it, may *justly* or *unjustly* triumph over the weak, in the exercise of

authority, because mere physical force constitutes right. That the strong, in many cases, have claimed dominion over the weak, on this ground, and exercised a tyrannical sway, the history of mankind abundantly declares; but that they had a *right* to do so, we have no evidence arising from reason, or the mere existence of the thing. It is a striking feature in every false system of religion, that it demands and enforces a compliance with its dogmas and ceremonies, simply because it possesses a coercive power. Any system of divinity which inculcates on its votaries, that because God possesses a power to do every thing, therefore He has a right to do every thing, distorts the perfections of God, elevates his attribute of power at the expense of all his other perfections; for if all his perfections be infinite, they represent his power as greater than the rest, therefore it must be more than infinite, or if it only be infinite, then the rest must be less than infinite, and thus their crude conceptions give to Him who is equal in all His attributes and in all His ways, a dwarfish body and gigantic head. As we cannot deduce the moral obligations of intelligent beings to worhip God, from His omnipotence, so neither can we from His *omniscience*. The maxim that "knowledge is power," can only be true in an accommodating sense, so far as invention tends to produce an easier method of effecting the same thing "If the iron be blunt, then must he put to more strength" saith the wise man; "but wisdom is profitable to direct." There is the same difference between knowledge and power, as there is between the perfection of eye and the strength of the arm. Mere knowledge in itself can produce no effect nor alteration in the existence of things, any more than the eye could upon the moon and planets, while it gazes upon any of them in its orbit. If *right* exist, it is not ignorant of it; it embraces it in its remotest relations, and discovers its utmost extent; but it no more lays the foundation of moral obligation than my seeing the sun constrains him to shine. A wise man has no right to the property of one who is foolish, because he could appropriate it to better purposes; neither because God knows what we are, what we are capable of doing, what worship we ought to give Him, does his knowledge, however exquisite and absolutely perfect, constitute the *right* to worship Him. He knows from what the obligation arises, and that, let it spring from what it may, it does

not take its rise from his omniscience.—Having now considered the natural perfections of God, we might proceed to the moral, and illustrate the subject of moral obligation in a similar manner. The mere fact of His being merciful, kind, good, holy, just and true, could never in itself constitute an authority over us, unless there were something additional that has not yet been noticed. Whatever it is, it must lay a foundation and constitute a claim, in relation to God, that no other being can possibly pretend to — that neither man nor angel — things visible nor invisible — that nothing in time or in eternity, can either have the slightest title to or consciousness of such a title; it must be a something that excludes comparison, similarity, and participation — a something that is simple, solitary, and exclusive in its nature; in fact, it must be a something constituting *His right of dominion over us*, that nothing can alter or destroy, and that even His own infinite power could not annul unless by annihilation. Wherein then does it consist?

2. *In our absolute dependence upon God for existence*—for the powers, passions, and members we possess. It is He that made us, and not we ourselves. "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein." Why? "For he hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods." Here is the true and exclusive cause why God has a *right* to our worship: because He is our creator, because His being and perfections stand to us in a relation which, without this, it would be impossible they ever could, and this relation arising from creation alone, lays the foundation for moral obligation. Were it possible that any other being had made us, we should be his property, and he alone should be entitled to our worship. He alone who made the soul has right to limit its powers, and demand its worship. "Behold all souls are mine," saith God, therefore "the soul that sinneth, it shall die." When God gives His law to the Jews on Sinai, it is prefaced by not only "I am the LORD," or JEHOVAH, expressing abstract existence; but "I am the LORD *thy* GOD," denoting possession and relation. This constitutes the reason of all the commands, and is particularly mentioned in the second, the third, the fourth, and the fifth — "Thou shalt not make unto thyself any graven image — thou shalt not bow thyself

unto them nor serve them." Why? "For I the LORD *thy* GOD am a jealous God." We being His entire property by creation, He is to be the only object of our adoration; nor are we to worship Him through the medium of any created thing. Here then is a position undeniable in its evidence, and unalterable in its nature, *that whatsoever is the creator of an intelligent agent should be the exclusive object of his worship.* Let the angels of God, the spirits of departed saints, prove themselves our creators, and we are bound to worship them. Let the sun, the moon, the stars, or any of the host of heaven, show that they are the sources of our intelligence and the framers of our bodies, and we are bound to worship them. Let an image of stone, iron, brass, silver, or gold, lift up its hand to heaven and demonstrate itself the creator of heaven and earth, and all the host of them, and we are bound to worship it. Let Moses and the prophets, Christ and the apostles, prove that the Messiah, Jesus Christ the Son of God, is the creator of the world, and all men and we are bound to worship Him. This is done beyond the possibility of cavil, by the apostle, in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Colossians — "For by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers; all things were created by him and for him," for his worship and glory. The following passage from Rev.iv.9,10,11, not only proves the right of worship founded on creation, but that Jesus Christ is entitled to the worship of every intelligent being simply because he is the creator of all things: "And when those beasts give glory and honour and thanks to him that sat on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever, the four and twenty elders fall down before him that sat on the throne, and worship him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power;" [for what reason?] — "for *Thou* hast *created all things*, and for thy pleasure they are and were created."

From all that has been now advanced, we come to the conclusion that the eternal existence and infinite perfections of God contained within themselves the only possibility of creation, or formation of finite spirit and material substance from the womb

of nothing; but that the *actual energy* or *volition* of the Divine Mind, in giving existence to all finite things, and man among the rest, constitutes the only foundation of His claim to our worship and obedience, and hence we resolve all moral obligation into the *act* of creation, or (what amounts to the same thing) into the *will* of God. He makes the claim upon us according to the nature, the capacity, and the powers which he has bestowed, and according to the circumstances in which he has placed us. It is impossible for us to obliterate the obligation: we cannot flee from ourselves, nor from Him to whom we are indebted, and on whose bounty, goodness, power, and will, we are absolutely dependent. He has given us understanding to perceive, and will capable of bending to His demand. We may resist the claim, but we cannot do it with impunity. Although his perfections, without communication of good, could make no demand on our worship; yet since He has given us being and capability, these perfections demand our highest admiration, and the entire Godhead our most unreserved submission. He created us that we might apprehend what he is, and be happy in the prostration of all our powers at the shrine of His glory. A devil or damned spirit cannot worship God, because its understanding is so obscured and its will so perverted that it never can apprehend Him otherwise than as an object of eternal wrath and terror. To such there is no Saviour; no atonement but the one they finally and eternally rejected; no grace to assist; no spirit of God to inspire and enable the soul to fulfil its moral obligation. Not so with us. There is an intercessor at the right hand of God: the Spirit is promised; and as we are under obligation to worship God, so we may "come boldly to the throne of the heavenly grace, and find mercy to pardon and grace to help in every time of need." Having now considered the source and import of our obligation to worship God, we come to inquire, in the last place, into

III. The nature of the worship He requires. This is briefly expressed in the text — *They that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.* As many of the human race know little or nothing of the being and perfections of the only true God; so there are many of those who believe in Him as the only self-existent being possessing every excellency, who know little

or nothing of the only worship pleasing in His sight. As the Samaritans confined their worship of Him to Mount Gerrizim, on which their temple was erected, and the Jews were equally tenacious of confining His worship to their synagogues, their city, and their temple; so thousands of professing Christians localize the presence and worship of God within the precincts of those habitations erected to His service, or to particular spots supposed to have been consecrated by the devotional exercises of some pious devotee. Let such stand corrected and ashamed by the declaration of Jesus to the woman of Samaria — *Woman, believe me the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mount, nor at Jerusalem, worship the Father.* And truly the hour cometh, (and in the estimation of every spiritual mind is already come) when neither in this party, or in that particular church, shall God be exclusively worshipped; but *in spirit and in truth* the true worshippers of God shall serve Him from the rising of the sun until his going down. As *God is a spirit* possessing in *reality* every glorious perfection, so Christianity teaches that the nature of the worship is to be defined and regulated by the nature and characteristics of the object adored. The worship of God, therefore, *must be in spirit and in truth.* Let us ascertain the nature of the worship given by any people, whether Christian or Heathen, and we may invariably infer not only the knowledge they have of, but the estimation in which they hold, the character of the god whom they adore. This is a rule, I apprehend, which admits of very few exceptions. We have the object of our worship now placed before us; and as we may deduce the nature of the object from the kind of worship given, so let us ascertain the nature of the worship from the being and perfections of the God of Christianity. It includes

1. *A spiritual and correct perception of the object. God is a Spirit* eternal, omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent, good, merciful, true, just and holy, subsisting in a trinity of persons, and only apprehended through the medium He himself may appoint; and hence, to worship Him aright, we must be brought to apprehend Him, not as we fancy, but as He is, or as He reveals Himself. Man is a creature fallen, sinful, and totally ignorant of God by nature. He is born into the world without one single idea or conception of any thing finite, much less of Him who is infinite,

spiritual, and immaterial. By the exercise of the senses, he attains a stock of ideas and notions, which the understanding may combine and arrange in forms of endless diversity. From these he may infer the existence of a Being eternal, possessed of wisdom and power; but by no effort of his reason can he apprehend God as he is. This is reserved for revelation in general, and for the operations of the Holy Ghost in particular, whose office is to convince of sin original and actual, — of unbelief arising from our dark, ignorant state; and of a true judgment of God, ourselves, and of the relation in which we stand to Him, by giving us proper perceptions of all things as they really are. The sinner, guided by his own appetites, desires and reason, neither receives nor knows the things of God, because they are spiritually discerned; but, when he becomes enlightened by the Holy Ghost, discovers himself sinful, lost and undone for ever — when he flies to the atoning blood of Christ — rests on its merits by faith — obtaining the forgiveness of all his sin, and is filled with the life and love of God; then, his spiritual senses are opened; like Moses he sees Him who is invisible, and in the works of creation, providence, and redemption, by the agency of the spirit of the Lord, as the genuine spiritual light of his soul, he beholds as in a mirror, the object of his worship. He perceives *that* God, who was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself. He praises Him for all that He is, loves Him because He is love, and prays to Him with a heart convinced of its absolute dependence on His bounty for time and for eternity. This apprehension of what God is, and what he has done, impresses his mind with a suitable sense of the divine character, stamps his religious performances with fervour, and produces a uniformity and consistency of character, that can only spring from genuine conviction.

2. *A right understanding of the medium is essential to the worship which God demands.* God must not only be worshipped *in spirit*, but *in truth* also. There must, therefore, be a *true medium* of approach to Him, without which our services cannot be acceptable. Should we understand this medium aright, we must have recourse *to the law and to the testimony* alone. The dogmas of philosophy and the traditions of the Jews, or those of a spurious religion, can afford us no assistance. Hearken then to the tes-

timony of God upon this subject: "We have a great high-priest, Jesus the Son of God, who by himself purged our sins, and having offered himself once for all, for ever sat down at the right hand of God. He is able to save to the uttermost *all that come unto God by Him. By him* let us therefore *offer the sacrifice of praise to God* continually; that is the *fruit* of our *lips* giving *thanks* to his *name.* He is the way and the truth and the life; *no man cometh unto the Father but by Him.*" We are not to approach God then through the blood of bulls and goats, presented by a Jewish priest; the law of carnal ordinances, imposed until the time of reformation, is abolished; a new dispensation is now existing, of which the Jewish was but a type or shadow. Christ is the *substance* or *truth* of the whole. We are to worship God *in spirit*, in opposition to those *carnal ordinances* which were signs, types, or figures to the *sense.* We are to adore God *in truth*, through him exclusively *in whom the fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily.* He is our *true* temple, priest, sacrifice, altar, and atonement. His blood *alone* can purge the conscience from *dead works* to *serve the living God.* He is the *only* mediator between God and man; and hence, as *all visible* and *tangible objects* are excluded as a medium of worship, so *every thing invisible*, whether angel or departed spirit, is equally prohibited as a medium through which we are to approach God in our devotions. Christ is the true and only light which can discover the Deity to man. As the sun can only be perceived through his own light, so God can only be discovered through himself. He, therefore, who approaches God must worship Him through that Being who is God manifested in our flesh: and he who attempts to worship the Godhead through any human invention, or through any thing existing but Christ Jesus, is as foolish as one who tries to gaze upon the sun through the medium of a taper, or through the intervention of darkness itself.

3. *The worship mentioned in our text demands the exercise of all our powers and passions, in simplicity and sincerity.* God must be worshiped *in spirit* and *in truth*, not only in opposition to every *material form*, but in the *unmixed simplicity* and *sincerity* of the *soul.* God is a spirit who searcheth and trieth the heart — a Being who is present with us at all times and in all places, and therefore requires the *first fruits* and continued offerings of our souls as

our creator and benefactor. The *understanding* must *contemplate, admire,* and *esteem* Him, as the *chief good.* Its language must be, *There is none good but one, that is God. How precious also are thy thoughts unto me, O God, how great is the sum of them! Should I count them, they are more in number than the sand: when I awake, I am still with thee.* The *will* must *incessantly* choose Him for *its portion,* and *continually* submit to Him under *every affliction* and *privation.* Our hearts must *love* Him, for what He *is,* and what He *has done,* and love every thing on which he places a value. As the flower expands its leaves to receive the solar ray, so our *desires* must embrace all that He is, and all that He is willing to communicate. The *hope* of our souls must quietly wait upon Him for all future good, while we rejoice in all that He is — all that He bestows, and all that He holds in reservation for us. In fine, our simplicity, sincerity, and unreserved dedication of ourselves to Him must exclude all pride, ostentation, self-seeking and desire of applause, from His service. Without this, the highest eloquence must prove an empty sound; the use of ceremonies, an unmeaning display; and the very zeal of martyrdom itself, an impure flame, that, burning towards heaven, finally expires in the marshy passions from which it had its origin. Let the man who would worship God, thus apprehend Him — thus send up his sacrifices through Christ Jesus alone — and thus devote all the powers and energies of the mind to Him who is a spirit, and then will he worship God in spirit and in truth, rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh. Let him possess the essentials to true worship in his own heart; and then, whether, he be in the city or in the field, whether he be in the church or in the street, whether he lie down or rise up, whether he be in sickness or in health, yea, whether he be on earth or in heaven, as *God is a spirit,* so he will *worship Him in spirit and in truth.* Thus we have considered the *object,* the *obligations,* and the *nature* of true worship. Let us now make a few inferences drawn from the whole.

1. We learn the difference between *true* and *false* religion, *true worship* and *superstitious observances.* True religion embraces the God of the Scriptures, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as it its only source and ultimate object; springs from agenuine sense of the obligations of the soul to worship Him, enlightens the understanding, gives a

gentle bias to the will — elicits all the passions of the soul, and enlists them in the service of God. It teaches us humbly to believe all the momentous truths of the Gospel, to practice its pure morality, fulfil its great and numerous duties, refer our final interests to eternity; and in the exercise of all its claims upon us, it instructs us to prize simplicity of intention and the disposition of the heart, above every external form whatsoever. Not so a false religion; it deals in deceitful substitutions. It places an idol in the stead of the true God, or, it attempts to worship Him through a false medium. It divides the unity of the Godhead as an object of worship, by excluding the personal subsistence of the Son and Holy Ghost from its essence, or it elevates created beings to His throne, and bids its votaries fall down and worship them. It substitutes human inventions for divine revelations, amiable dispositions for spiritual graces, reformation of manners for regeneration, personal chastisements for divine atonement, and an endless round of ceremonies or of barren performances, for the inward and spiritual worship of the heart.

2. From what has been advanced we learn *the necessity of stated times and appointed places, in which to worship God.* It is not merely our privilege "to pray always in the spirit," or "to pray without ceasing," or according to the apostolic direction "to pray every where;" but we must also have *stated periods* and *particular places* in which we will manifest the spirit which actuates us, and demonstrate to others the necessity of becoming worshippers of the true and living God. He requires not only an inward but an outward worship, and it must not only be in private, but in public; not merely be at any period we may choose, but at the time appointed by Himself, which is one day out of seven. Thus the revolution of the heavenly bodies, joined with the artificial measurement of time, will tend to warn us of His Being, and the time devoted to His service; while houses erected to His honour will stand as so many monuments of our belief in what He is, and of the obligations under which we are to worship Him in our bodies and in our souls. When a building is erected to the worship of God, it should never be appropriated to any other purpose. It becomes exclusively the house and property of God; first, because it is separated from the common purposes of life; and secondly,

because it is dedicated to the service of God alone. Neither before its erection, or after it ceases to answer the end designed, are we called upon to treat its premises with any peculiar kind of reverence; but, while we recognize it as the sanctuary of Jehovah, our entire deportment should shew that He has His name written there, and that there particularly He is to meet with His sincere followers, and receive the humble offerings of their souls in His service. This house is now dedicated to God alone. This day we have given it up as His exclusive property. He created the earth. He apportioned it out to man. We have taken of His own, and we have given it back to Him. Let us always act under this conviction, and treat the place where we stand as the property and habitation of God. Let us contribute freely of our substance in presenting it to His honour, without the incumbrance of debt, and show by our voluntary offerings this day, that we will not withhold His own property in defraying the expense of a place now dedicated to His own service. In conclusion, let us avoid the hateful custom, which extensively prevails in the north of Ireland, of entering even to, and retiring from the very centre of the house of God, with the head covered. It is a custom which runs to the extreme of superstition, and indicates an indifference and independence which should not characterize the true taught worshippers in any denomination. And now to the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost be all glory ascribed, world without end. Amen.

O'CONNELL AND THE WESLEYANS.

THE CALUMNIES, FALSEHOODS, AND RELIGION

OF

O'CONNELL EXPOSED,

THE QUERIES PROPOSED BY HIS SON MAURICE, SATISFACTORILY ANSWERED, AND

PROTESTANTISM DEFENDED,

IN SEVEN LETTERS.

THE LAST OF WHICH IS NOW PUBLISHED FOR THE FIRST TIME,

WITH

BABYLON FALLEN,

A POEM IN 32 STANZAS.

BY

DANIEL M'AFEE,

WESLEYAN MINISTER.

"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils. Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats."—1. Tim. iv. 1.—3.

CORK:

(PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,)

BY PURCELL & SON, 88, PATRICK STREET.

1839.

TO DANIEL O'CONNELL, Esq., M. P.

Sir,

For many years past I have looked upon you as the most extraordinary personage of this or any other age. You say you are the best abused public person now living. Satan himself may say the same, because, like him, there is something about you very extraordinary, and different from common men and common fiends. I wish to do you justice, and give, according to the common saying, even Satan himself his due. Every circumstance has hitherto combined to distinguish you from your fellows, and you have possessed sufficient qualifications and tact to press them into your service. You got yourself returned to sit in Parliament before your legal disabilities were removed; you undoubtedly could have been returned for more places of late years than any man that ever sat in the British senate; you have gathered up more priestly influence around yon than any other layman ever had; you have swayed the destinies of Ireland for years back; you hold the present government in leading strings; you have caused Popery to lift up her head, not only in Ireland but throughout the world; you have levied a tax, through the agency of the Priests and your votataries, off the starving poor of Ireland, so that Rome has been fleeced of her Peter-pence year after year, and you have been emphatically but truly denominated the "big beggarman"; you sold the Catholic cause in 1825, according to the charge of honest Jack Lawless against you, by attaching the wings to the bill—the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders and the payment of the priests; and yet you have had the adroitness to make all the several parties believe you are perfectly disinterested in taking the money of a famishing population; no man cried out more loudly than you against rotten boroughs; and yet you sold, if report be true, the county of Carlow for one thousand pounds; you enticed, by your agents at the Kerry election, a poor peasant to vote for your son Maurice, against the interests of his landlord, and when turned out of his farm, you refused him the smallest sum out of the money then in the funds of your association to relieve him, although the application was signed by several of the most respectable of your adherents in Tralee. On that occasion it was thought your covetousness triumphed over every principal of gratitude. Surely you are a very extraordinary character indeed! In my judgment you are en-

pope, bishops, and priests—it incontestibly follows, that the Church of Rome has "*departed* from the *faith*" and *teaches* "*doctrines* of devils." Now, Sir, you may take one or other of these alternatives—to the horns of this dilemma I suspend you; and you may hang bleaching in the winds of heaven, until John of Tuam, whose *lignum sacordotale* was dug out of some Irish bog, or Father Tom Maguire, the slain by Mr. Gregg, or the wicked jesuit who furnished you with the batch of lies about John Wesley comes to cut you down. In the mean time, I am amusing myself with this thought about transmigration of souls. Which of the ancients now actuates you? Undoubtedly, *Simon Magus*. He was a great layman; so are you. He bewitched the people with his sorceries; so *do* you with your blarney. He was a "big beggarman;" so are you. He wanted to purchase the Holy Spirit with money; so do you, when you go to a priest for pardon. He professed to be a christian; so do you. He had "neither lot nor part in the matter;" neither have you. The Apostle exhorted him to pray to God for repentance; I exhort you. Hence, you must, if transmigration be true, be *that* very Simon—Simon Magus.

Fourthly, The passage now in question is taken from the *Clementin* edition of the Latin Vulgate, revised and corrected by his infallible hand. This is the pure, correct, and *infallible* translation *last made* with corrections. Pray, Sir, why did you permit that Jesuit who furnished you with the libels on John Wesley to make a fool of you in your old age, in relation to the Latin Vulgate! You make a parade of reading which is not your own, of would-be scholarship about what you are evidently ignorant of; and, strutting around in borrowed plumes, it is soon discovered you are nothing but a mere screech owl, whose eyes neither admit the light of true information, nor religion. Were you not aware (no; the Jesuit kept that out of your brief) that the old hypocrite and tyrant, Pope Sextus the V. published a correct edition of the Vulgate, in 1590, cursing the brains, lips, teeth, hands, fingers, nose and hair of him who would ever presume to alter the *least particle* of it; and that in 1592, Clementin came in for the curse, by making 2,000 variations, some of whole verses, and several quite contradictory, and published the work accompanied by an anathema, more dreadful if possible than that of Sextus?—On this point I might here say more, only, I am aware, you have fallen into the ablest hand in the empire—that of Mr. M'Ghee on this subject. From his chastisement you cannot escape. Why now find fault with the Manchester Educational Committee, or the Wesleyans generally, for a repugnance on our part to admit a translation falsified in many things by infallible imposters? Why blame us for not wishing state support—public money, to a body of men calling themselves a church, and yet, according to their own Clementin edition, they are teaching "doctrines of devils!" could we act in this way without renouncing christianity itself?

Fifthly, Ths passage now under consideration furnishes us with a clue to account for the many lies contained in your letters. The church which forbids her priests to marry, and commands her members to abstain from meats, is a lying church. "Speaking lies in hypocrisy," for wordly and political ends. She lies in calling herself one, holy, catholic, apostolic and infallible. Here are five lies in rank and file. She lies in substituting tradition for the Word of God; in pretending to absolve from sins; in

making seven sacraments instead of two; in imposing upon the sense and reason by transubstantiations and in causing her votaries to worship the host; images and pictures. Here are five lies more. She lies in teaching the doctrine of justification by works; in granting indulgences, aye, even for "perjury" (see the resolutions of the Committee, which galled you so much;) in her will-worship of saints and angels; in teaching her abominable doctrine of purgatory, whereby she detracts from the virtue of Christ's blood; and in her penances, which do away with the atonement. Here are five lies more; and if we take into account her mummeries, her ceremonies, her holy-water, beads, crosses, Agnus Deis, censors, incense, mock miracles (recollect Hohenloe, Miss Lalor and Mrs. Stewart), and the endless variety of her relics, we shall have an accumulation of varnished lies, such as would put the religion of Budhu to shame in point of magnitude, weight and quality. It is evident, then, Sir, your church has departed from the faith in these, "*last times.*" To me it is not extraordinary, then, no not in the least, that you should belie, and bespatter, and pour out the filth of your corrupt heart and imagination on the character and memory of the truly venerable Wesley. Your very first religious impressions were lies. You got them in the nursery; they have been identified with your very being; they have been fostered by your circumstances; and it is become as natural for you to deal in misrepresentations as it is to breathe. Who would expect candour and truth from O'Connell? Not even your friends. You denied the death's head and cross bones before the nation, though you used the expression in the presence of thousands, many of whom I know, who heard you. Let it astonish no man, if you should, ere long, deny some paragraph in your own letters to the Wesleyans, and say it was foisted in by some Tory printer.

You boast of your letter being unanswerable, and evidently feel at the same time wounded to the soul at the summary manner in which you were treated by the committee in Manchester. That resolution about the perjury stung your callous heart; it brought the blood to your face at the first reading. No doubt it made you cross yourself, and tell your beads half a dozen times. From that charge you have no resource but in your effrontry before the world, and from your church in your secret meditations. She cannot remit your sin, if there were no other reason but her having so many of her own. But you say your "letter is unanswerable." Who told you so? Why, "some protestant gentlemen gave it as their opinion that it could not be answered." Pray was Owen of Lanark one of them? Was Mr. Hume another? or did you consult some of the Birmingham rioters to gain a Protestant opinion? Sir, no genuine Protestant in the empire ever said so. He has been what we call a "kiln-dried one," who holds the Book of Common Prayer in one hand, Paine's Age of Reason in the other, and carries the host in his mouth at the same time.

I come now to the easiest part of my task, namely, to notice your charges, and point out your falsehoods, as it regards the Wesleyans.

1. You charge us with "being inveterate enemies of freedom of conscience." How can you say so, when we have through evil report and good report, been preaching deliverance from the guilt and tyranny of sin, through faith in the blood of Christ, for the last century? Even in Ireland, for the last 80 years past, God has made us instrumental in liberating the consciences

of many hundreds of Roman Catholics, not only from the guilt of sin, but from the oppressions of Popery. Sir, you have touched on an important point, in talking about freedom of conscience. I feel obliged to you for the subject. What freedom of conscience is among the poor Priest-ridden Papists of Ireland? Does it consist in selling the last hen and her eggs to pay the Priest for his mock pardon, or in their own estimation be damned to all eternity? Does it consist in having their iniquity exposed publicly from the altar, if the Priest is not paid his dues? What liberty of conscience did the poor woman possess, who in the county of Wicklow was sentenced by the Priest to go round an old ruined chapel at the silent hour of 12 o'clock at night, because he discovered that she read the new testament? What liberty of conscience did the poor people possess, who on various occasions, when listening to Ousley and others preaching in the streets, have been subjected to the lash of the Priest's whip, while it cut and sounded like that of a negro driver? You talk of liberty of conscience, forsooth! What is this but a strumpet boasting of her virtue? No man knows better than you do, that the Papist's liberty of conscience is carried in the Priest's pocket. He is to such the town clock, and hence no man dare carry a watch or exercise his private judgment. Why talk of liberty of conscience in a church which denies the right of private judgment in religion? There cannot possibly be any such thing among you.

2. But you say we "are enemies to religious liberty." What do you mean? I cannot understand you. Do we prevent the circulation of the Scriptures among the Irish peasantry? The Priests do; not we. Do we at any time disturb the established clergy, even in the sanctuary of the dead, while performing the rites of Christian burial? Your *finest pisintry* upon the face of the earth do; not we. This is the work of "the beloved black feet and white feet." Do we curse from the altar, those fathers, mothers, or guardians, who, under any circumstances, would send their children to a Protestant school? The priests do; not we. When you, Sir, popped on your knees in the gutter at Ennis, during the time of your first election, to receive the benediction of a Popish bishop, did we interfere? Not at all; we only laughed at your hypocrisy. You may worship the Virgin Mary from morning till night, dip your legal wig in holy water, thump your breast at a holy well, hang a rag on the adjoining bush, hurl and dance after Mass, or during its service fall on your face to a crucifix stuck on the wall, and after all hold a political meeting within the precincts of the chapel and receive your pocketful of "the tribute," and not one of us will ever intermeddle or endeavour to prevent you. No, no, Mr. O'Connell; we will only pity your ignorance, abhor your folly and sin, pray for your deliverance from the worst thing connected with you, namely, your religion; and try simply to hinder you from forcing the Host into our mouth, dragging us to Mass with a halter round our neck, and fire faggot at our tails.

3. But we are equal enemies to "civil liberty." Stop, Mr. O'Connell, who told you so? The Jesuit: never mind him; mind me. Go, ask the negroes in the West Indies, who contributed most to their liberty? Who sent in the greatest number of petitions to parliament. Certainly the Wesleyans as a body. How many came from "the hereditary bondsmen" of Ireland? Less than from any other party in the empire, How do you

account for this? I account for it thus: you are the greatest clamourers for liberty to yourselves in the wide world, because you have the disposition, and claim the right to make all others slaves to you. Slavery is consonant to the very genius of Popery. What are your notions of civil liberty? A liberty to trample on your neighbours—a liberty for the mob to raise demagogues like you on their shoulders—a liberty for the Tipperary Ribbonmen to murder all who consent to pay tithes or even rent, if they disapprove of it—a liberty for the priests to rule this country through you, and raise their wicked ecclesiastical law above the civil. Here is your aim throughout the empire: and if we are defaulters in not assisting you, you may fault St. John and not us, who shews that the church rising above the secular powers is the mother of harlots, riding on the beast.

4. But, "John Wesley was one of the principal founders or managers of that protestant association, which in June, 1780, raised a rebellion in London, &c." How is this to be answered? Very promptly. It is a *flat, clumsy, ill-digested,* and *monstrous falsehood*—a mere popish pasquinade —an O'Connellite, written with a front of brass, and a "conscience seared with a hot iron." No man but Simon Magus could advance this. You might as well assert that John Wesley was father Halligan, who in the massacre of 1641, confessed his congregation, gave them absolution for the crime not yet perpetrated, and sent them hot from the altar to murder every protestant, man, woman and child who came in their way. You might as readily assert, Sir, that John Wesley, put the torch to Scullabogue barn, during the late rebellion, when it was filled with protestants, who thus suffered by popish cruelty and treachery. You might as readily attempt to make the nation believe that he was the bloody associate of Gardiner and Bonner, two infallibles of your church in the days of brutal Queen Mary. The history and character of Mr. Wesley, are too well known for you to tarnish his fame. Where are your proofs? You cannot produce them. I know right well the ground on which you tread. Father O'Leary and Mr. Wesley at that time had a controversy. O'Leary, like a true son of his lying mother, charged Mr. Wesley with plunder, chapel burning, raising the mob, and all manner of evil of his own invention. Nay, more, he published a forged letter, with Mr. Wesley's name to it, and his own reply in relation to that accusation. You lay hold on the forgery, and after O'Leary has gone to his reward, you rake up his roguery and wickedness, and father it on Mr. Wesley. The annals of the world cannot furnish a piece of greater insolence than this. It is barefaced, unblushing impudence, which can only be repelled with the scorn and indignation of every man who has any regard for truth. The name of Wesley, Sir, will live when your's is written in the dust; and his followers will constitute a section of the universal church, when your Popes, Bishops, Priests, Friars, and Church itself, shall have melted away like the snow in Spring.

A word or two respecting your representation of Mr. Wesley's creed and changes in religion, and I have done. Every body knows, that though Mr. Wesley received religious information from the Moravians, and especially from Peter Bohler, yet he never was a Moravian. Neither was he at any time an Antinomian or a Calvinist of any kind. When Mr. Wesley speaks of himself as being a Papist, in his early proceedings, he only

means, that he sought salvation by works and not by faith; and that he was ignorant, self-righteous, unconverted, and destitute of the true scriptural plan of salvation. He never invented, as you state, two modes of justification—one without repentance and the other with it. He never taught, as you aver, either in whole or in part, that all must be damned who come under your three categories. The whole of what you have written on this point contains this truth and nothing more, that Mr. Wesley in his search after true inward religion, increased by degrees in knowledge; as you did in the study of the law. And now, Sir, do you think the public are such fools as to fancy for a moment, that you took the trouble of reading Mr. Wesley's works, in sixteen volumes octavo, Mr. Fletcher's in ten or twelve, and the Centenary volume, that you might be able to give to the public a fair statement of his opinions and doctrines. There is not a man in the empire believes this, or that you took any pains whatever. The general opinion, is that which I have advanced—that some Priest or Jesuit furnished you with the raw materials, and you arranged them in form, and sent them forth to the world as your own. I know Mr. Wesley's works and the progress of his opinions, and I have now no hesitation in saying, that the paragraphs on this point, in your letter, are wilful, conscious, deliberate falsehoods. In fact, this part of your letter above all others defies criticism. You had abundant evidence before you in Wesley's works "clear as the sun."—You have not only distorted but invented. That part of your letter relating to his religious views and conduct, exhibits as lamentable a picture of ignorance, impudence, falsehood, bare-faced distortion, unmanly and satanic perversion of truth, as ever was presented to the human eye in the same compass of words, not only since the invention of printing, but since the foundation of christianity.

In conclusion, I would just say, Sir, that had you not invited us to submit to your Church, and spoken of Her as "the pillar and ground of the truth," it is very likely I would not have noticed you; I would have acquiesced in the dignified, summary, and judicious resolutions of the Manchester Educational Committee; I would have left the history, character, and creed of Wesley, to speak for themselves, knowing that all stand too high for you to touch, much less to tarnish. You entered into controversy once with the Rev. Robert Daly on transubstantiation. I read your letter It was

> A specimen rare, upon the whole,
> Of the figure of speech called rigmarole,
> For it hath no body, much less a soul.

It was a piece of unmixed balderdash from beginning to end. Come, now, if you please try your hand with me. Fix on any doctrine you choose: any in this letter; and I pledge myself to demonstrate it to be "a doctrine of devils." Keep to 1 Tim. iv. 1.—3. Get out of the dilemma if you can. I now defy you. You cannot. If so the whole controversy is decided; your Church is a false church, and has departed from the faith.

I am, Sir, a Wesleyan Minister, who repels your invitation with christian indignation.

DANIEL M'AFEE.

Cork, August 8, 1839.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SOUTHERN REPORTER.

Killarney, August 11th 1839.

Sir,—In the *Constitution* or *Cork Advertiser* of yesterday's date, I have read a letter addressed to my father, purporting to be the production of a "Mr. Daniel M'Afee," a Wesleyan Minister, residing in Cork. I do not mean to deny Mr. M'Afee's right—if he thinks proper—to enter into controversy with my father; on the contrary, while I cannot but pity his folly, I must admire his audacity. His epistle is valuable thus far, that it shows that my father's late letter to the Wesleyan gentry at Manchester —the Rigges, Woodses, &c.—has had the effect of inducing, at least, one zealous minister of their profession, to come forward and show his contempt for their resolutions, by entering into open controversy, on matters, the discussion of which, by persons of his class, the aforesaid resolutions were intended to prohibit. But, Sir, Mr. Daniel M'Affee has introduced my name into his manifesto after the following fashion:—

"You" (meaning my father) "enticed by your agents at the Kerry Election, a poor man, to vote for your son Maurice, against the interests of his landlord, and when turned out of his farm, you refused him the smallest sum out of the money then in the funds of your Association, to relieve him, although the application was signed by several of the most respectable of your adherents in Tralee."

Now, let me call upon Mr. Daniel M'Affee simply to state—

1st.—At what Election was I a candidate for Kerry? for so I must translate the term "Kerry Election."

2ndly,—Waiving that point, at which of the elections for Tralee, where I was a candidate, did the case he alludes to occur?

3rdly.—The name of this "poor peasant," and of the landlord "against whose interests he voted," and who consequently "turned him out of his farm"—as also, in what part of the borough of Tralee said farm is situate.

Until Mr. Daniel M'Affee states the name of the man—and of the landlord by whom he was ejected, I shall hold him guilty of a base slander on the conservative gentry of Tralee. They have always strenuously opposed me; I believe they are ready to do so on any future occasion; but I most willingly do them the justice of saying, that I never heard of any such act of civil oppression on their part as that which Mr. Daniel M'Affee has asserted. And now, mark, I pray you, how admirable an advocate for freedom of conscience this man must be. He condemns not the conduct of his imaginary landlord. He would have allowed his poor peasant, at the bidding of any landlord, to have prostituted his conscience for the base motive of wordly lucre. The freedom from perjury of the man's immortal soul did not interest him; it is only into the condition of his breeches' pocket that Mr. M'Afee condescends to inquire. If I am to guess at Mr. M'Affee's country from his name, he ought to be the native of a land whose children are proverbially cautious and prudent. Whether he has observed that caution in one part of his lucubration, I leave your readers to judge. As for the remainder of the production, the reply thereunto rests with the person to whom he has addressed it.

I have the honor to be, Sir, your faithful Servant,

MAURICE O'CONNELL.

TO MAURICE O'CONNELL, Esq. M.P. FOR TRALEE.

Sir,—I was puzzled a little, whether I could address this letter to you, to your father, or to the editor of the *Cork Constitution*. I felt a repugnance at first, to notice you in this form, because I consider you rather an insignificant kind of man—without any talent to distinguish you, and almost entirely worthless as it regards the borough of Tralee, and the official duties of parliament. I should rather think, several, even of your friends, are beginning to feel as I do. There are two kinds of weather—wet and dry—which must keep your inefficiency before their eyes. You know, Sir, that in a fine, dry, sunny day, the nearest way from Tralee to Blennerville, is by the banks of the canal, or rather an immense rut about an English mile long. It is impossible for any one to view it unfinished, and now constituting a nuisance, without saying or thinking—"these O'Connells can talk and bluster, and make fair speeches; but what have they done? This canal so called, has remained for years in this state, and it would seem, that as far as they are concerned, it must remain so for ever." And then when the flood comes rolling down from that hilly region, your worthlessness is not only seen but felt, by the inhabitants of Tralee. For want of improvement the streets get flooded, and this oftener than in other places, and are proverbial for the bad state in which they generally are. What then have you done in relation to one or other of these things? Had not a mistake of mine, which I will soon notice, afforded you the opportunity of appearing before the public, your constituents could scarcely tell whether you were living or dead. From these considerations, my impression at first was, that I should not address you; but on reading your letter a second time, I found you to be the son of your father—you exhibit the same pride, bigotry, contempt, misrepresentation, and uncandid, shifting, wriggling spirit in miniature, which he has displayed at large before the world. Give you the same versatility of talent to develope it fully, and the evil passions of corrupt nature would appear in you as they do in him. You evidently approve of his lies and his slander, and thereby make them your own. As it is his spirit, and not individuals merely, which I oppose, I cannot be wrong therefore in addressing you, for at any rate I am engaged in resisting the arch fiend—the spirit which works, and especially through popery, in the children of disobedience. You say, Sir, in the commencement of your letter, "while I cannot but pity his folly, I must admire his audacity." So, then, it is great folly in me to enter the list of controversy with your father! Wonderful man that he is! a lawyer, a statesman, a mere popish harlequin, who comes forth to arouse the public with his lying antics, that he may prepare the way for the begging-box, and for emptying the pockets shortly of our deluded countrymen. Surely, Sir, there was no folly in David's throwing a stone at the vaunting Goliath of Gath, for it struck him in the forehead; and there can be little folly, indeed, in my resisting Simon Magus now, as Protestant Peter did of old. The devil was resisted from the beginning, and yet he is as wicked and persevering in evil now, as he was at any former time. Your father, no doubt, will follow his example; but this forms no reason why he also should not be resisted. You need not therefore pity my folly in trying to do a hopeless work. But it is also in your estimation great "audacity."

You admire this. You think I have spirit and boldness. Why should I not? Though I am not from "the land of mountain and of flood," as you infer "I ought to be" from my name, yet I was born within sight of it, in the province of Ulster, and, to tell you the plain truth, I have no doubt but some of my ancestors assisted John Knox to break the graven images in Scotland at the time of the reformation. Sir, I am an Irishman as well as you, but fortunately I happened to be bred in a place in which, within a circle of twelve miles round, you could not fill a mass-house. Does this account for my spirit and boldness? Not entirely, I have read my Bible; I have submitted to its authority and imbibed its spirit. Nay more, for years I have been familiarly acquainted with the history, doctrines, spirit, practices and iniquity of Popery. I have marked its deceit, falsehood, superstitions and tyranny in the south and west of my country. I have seen all its spirit, attributes, lying and varnished iniquity, embodied in your father as a public man. I have compared it with the Bible; and the Scriptures have taught me to hate it, as they would have me to hate sin and Satan. I may, it is true, be of a different spirit from some good natured, easy-going kind of Protestants, that, in this age of liberality, would blush to contradict Satan himself. In addressing your father I have shown something of Paul's spirit, when he said to Elymas the sorcerer, who belonged to the Magus family—"O! full of all subtility and all mischief, thou child of the devil—thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" There is nothing, therefore, remarkable in my spirit and boldness. It is the spirit of the apostles and martyrs—of the reformers and patriots—the true patriots, that love this country, not for the sake of its luxuriant plains and its beggar's pence; but because the souls of its inhabitants, bought with a Saviour's blood, are cheated with Popish lies, and kept in the thraldom of sin, by roguish priests and self interested demagogues. I proceed, Sir, to answer your queries. Here you will find me an honest man—no Popish shuffling—no Jesuitry—no want of candour. I glory in being the opposite of your father. You now shall have a distinct answer.

1st—"At what election was I candidate for Kerry?" In my letter to your father I alluded to the election of 1835. In that I said "your son Maurice," instead of "your nephew Morgan." I thought you at that time were the member for the county. You will forgive this mistake, seeing there are so many O'Connells now thrust into parliament through priestly influence, that any man who does not keep a list of the family is liable to confound the Maurices and the Morgans. I confess that in this case I became a priest for once; for I transubstantiated you into Morgan and Morgan into you; and yet, you are the identical Mr. Maurice O'Connell still (and not Morgan) that you were before—I put you into the county instead of the borough. Think on this for a little, and, perhaps, I may make a convert of you. You cannot be transubstantiated into Morgan, simply because Morgan exists; and the wafer cannot possibly be transubstantiated into Christ's body, simply because it exists—and existed in heaven for 1,800 years before even the grain of that wafer grew in a field. Don't you think now that the priest is a fool for indulging such a fancy, and a knave for teaching it? But then he is infallible, and hence his lies are all truth?

2dly—" At which of the elections for Tralee, where I was a candidate, did the case he alludes to occur?" The election was for the county, not for the borough, and hence I should have said Morgan and not you. It was the election of 1835.

3dly—The name of his " poor peasant," and of the landlord " against whose interests he voted," and who " consequently turned him out of his farm." This now is the great point. Here you fancied you had a triumph ; but the triumph of the wicked is short. You thought, forsooth, that I had brought a false charge against your father, simply because I confounded your name with that of Morgan O'Connell. It is my business now to substantiate it, and bring it against him with tenfold force. I am sure he will not commend you for a great stock of Scotch, or even Irish prudence, for interfering. From the cautious manner in which you propose the question, I am strongly inclined to think, that you knew the case right well, and that you have taken this plan to lead away from the main point in hand, namely, the charge of hard-heartedness, and ingratitude, which I brought against your selfish father. A cracked brick or a broken slate, according to O'Connell's judgment, would be quite sufficient to condemn a most substantial building, or make the world believe it has no existence. This, however, will not do. The fact of your father's cupidity, unthankfulness, and want of charitable feeling, remains where I placed it—unaltered. I said to him, " You enticed by your agents, at the Kerry election, a poor man to vote for your nephew Morgan, (now I am correct) against the interest of his landlord, and when turned out of his farm, you refused him the smallest sum out of the money then in the funds of your association, to relieve him, although the application was signed by several of the most respectable of your adherents in Tralee." Here is a condensed statement of a fact, the circumstances of which I conceived it unnecessary to detail in my letter to your father, You have now called upon me publicly to do so, or you will " hold me guilty of a base slander on the conservative gentry of Tralee"—that is, you will place me on the same pedestal with your father, whom I heard slander, satirise, and abuse them from the balcony of the chamber of commerce in Tralee. I cannot help here mentioning another fact, as I pass along, in connexion with slander and satanic wickedness of the meanest, basest, and lowest bred order, that I ever heard attributed to your father, during his career of malevolence and lying. His own cousin, Priest Connor, wrote, at the heels of the same election, a libellous production against the character of an inhabitant of Tralee—a man of as upright principles and character as any other in Ireland, and one who was and is esteemed by the peasantry as a very honest man, which is their highest commendation in point of trade. His business principally lay with them. The libel appeared in the *Tralee Mercury*. This person's trade was injured for some time—exclusive dealing took place—he prosecuted the *Mercury* and the jury found damages. Your father, in the same speech made from the balcony, before some thousands of the peasantry, turning his face towards this person's shop, (I saw him,) satirised and abused the " rueful swadler" as he termed him. Thus in his meanness, malignity, and uncalled for display of the most inveterate hatred towards the interest of an honest man, advanced in years, with a large family, Simon Magus gave a magic miniature representation of the priest's libel, the natural tendency of

which was, to keep up the same feeling in the vulgar mind, and produce the same effect. On that occasion he reminded me of those fiends which, at their own request, were sent into the herd of swine—his spirit was mean, grovelling, violent, miserable and destructive. So much, now, for "a digression for sake of digression." You wish now, sir, to have the names of the peasant and the landlord. Here they are, John Hickson, Esq., of Grove, near Dingle, and William Shanahan. Are your eyes now opened? It is to evil, and not to good. The case will now go against you. It stands thus:—Shanahan was tenant to Mr. Hickson. He had a vote for the county. He faithfully and repeatedly promised to vote for the Knight of Kerry who was always a stanch advocate for Catholic Emancipation, and a man to whom the O'Connells and Romanists were bound to show gratitude. Shanahan not only gave the pledge to his landlord, but to several other gentlemen. The election came on; he violated his promise, and voted for your cousin Morgan. How was this effected? Who was the agent? You did not propose this question in your letter. Let me, however, give it a reply. It was a priest—pious man!—who, for the good of the church, would make Shanahan lie and act ungratefully, and then forgive him at the next confession. He first influenced his wife (see how minutely I am acquainted with the transaction,) and the two joining, like the serpent and Eve, caused this son of old Adam to sin, and finally to be cast out of his paradise. In the course of some time Shanahan's rent became due. It was demanded of course. He either could not or would not pay. He was destrained. He ran into law against his landlord. Three records were the issue. He was cast in each, and in fact was ruined. His losing the farm was the result of his own folly and obstinacy. How did Mr. Hickson treat him in the end, after all his unjustifiable conduct? Let Shanahan answer for himself. Here are his own words taken from a letter written by him to the editor of the *Kerry Evening Post*:—"With every kind, generous, and humane feeling, he (Mr. Hickson) forgave all costs, charges, and expenses attendant on three records, besides giving himself, his father-in-law, and brother-in-law who were equally involved with himself their stock, furniture, &c., by paying only one gale's rent out of a large arrear, on giving him possession of the farm." Such is the testimony of this man to the conduct and character of Mr. Hickson. Pray, sir, do I now slander the conduct of the conservative gentry of Kerry? Many of them know me; and I am certain that your insidious remark on this point will only excite the disgust of their high, stanch, and unflinching minds. In sound, Protestant feeling, they are not excelled by any of the same class in Ireland. We have seen Mr. Hickson's conduct towards Shanahan, who gave him every opposition in his power; let us now glance at that of Daniel O'Connell, Esq., M.P.—"the great liberator, emancipator, pacificator, regenerator, elevator, and renovator of Ireland," as one of his worthy admirers once said in a speech. He and Shanahan were of the same holy, orthodox, and infallible church; they repaired to the same kind of confessional for pardon, they expected, no doubt, being contemporaries, finally to alleviate each other's pains in the fire of purgatory; they fought for the good of the church in one spirit at the hustings; and besides all this, poor deluded Shanahan had hitherto been a collector of the "rent." In the midst of his deepest distress, he repairs to Tralee. His case is right well

known to the priests, and the gentlemen of the Chamber of Commerce. They feel for him. His case is stated in a letter addressed to your father. The first name is that of Dr. M'Ennery, the vicar-general of the Popish diocese. I know several of the others to be most respectable men. Here is the document;—

August 16, 1836.

"Sir,—We, the undersigned clergy and freeholders of Tralee, most respectfully recommend the bearer, Mr. Wm. Shanahan, to your consideration. The losses that he has sustained, in consequence of his vote at the last election, compel him to apply to you for aid, or for advice how to procure some remuneration elsewhere. We have, Sir, no hesitation in declaring, that, if had voted for the opposite party, he would have no occasion at present to solicit aid from any person, and we think the refusal of some assistance, would be productive of very evil consequences, inasmuch as it may have a bad effect on the next election. His relatives and many other freeholders had been induced by him to vote for the popular candidates, and if he is allowed to remain in his present misery, many, who now look on him will be deterred from voting honestly, when they know that a similar misfortune awaits themselves, if they vote against the wishes of their landlords. He is truly to be pitied.

We are, Sir, with great respect and esteem, your obedient servants and respectful friends,

John G. M'Ennery,	Francis De La Hunt,	Michael Reddy,
Eugene O,Sullivan,R.C.C	Bryan O'Connor,	Daniel Supple, jun.
Michael O'Sullivan, P. P.	Francis O'Sullivan,	Timothy Donovan,
R. Leyne,	John Casey,	Gerald Fitzgibbon,
Edm. Fitzmaurice, R.C.C.	Patrick Hallinan,	Thomas Stack,
Thomas Bunton,	Charles Daly,	Francis Heady,
Richard Donovan,	Edmond Stack,	Dennis Hurley.
James Poyntz.		

"To Daniel O'Connell, Esq. M.P. &c. &c."

See poor Shanahan! now he has got the letter in his possession. It is the month of August. He is on his way to Derrynane. He climbs the hills with energy, and traverses the glens with a light step and lighter heart. He sighs to see his neighbours reaping and himself without a sheaf; but he is on his way to the mansion of power, hospitality, friendliness, and unbounded charity, and ere the breath of his heaving breast has freely mingled with the atmosphere, his contracted lips send forth a joyous whistle. He will soon see the great O'Connell—the patriot whose heart has almost been on the eve of rending in a thousand speeches (not pieces) over the wrongs, woes, and oppressions of his "hereditary bondsmen." His reception will be cordial, his services appreciated, and his merits and sufferings amply rewarded. He is now a made man; he examines his purse to see if it will bear the weight of gold, that it will be his good fortune to carry home. He arrives at the mansion. He goes in it is true, at the back gate, but expects to go out at the front. His petition is sent up to the "lord of the treasury," and is returned with this reply, which I myself saw in Mr. O'Connell's own handwriting at the foot of the petition.

"I should consent to have all my family excluded from parliament, and myself also, sooner than have applications made to me for money in this shape. DANIEL O'CONNELL."

With what feelings did poor Shanahan now return from Derrynane? He describes them in the following extract from his letter to the editor of the *Kerry Evening Post*, dated August the 29th, 1836 :—

" It is the duty of the public at large to look forward to a future period when similar circumstances might foolishly involve them, such as have involved myself. Let them do so and vote for the liberal side, which I have every reason to call illiberal and ungrateful, and they shall experience misery on the one hand, and a cold, unfeeling, denial on the other, such as I met with from the Liberator at his own house, in Derrynane Abbey, on the 23d instant, written by himself at the tail of a petition, signed by the respectable clergy, and the other respectable gentlemen who lent their names, placing that confidence in him, which he and his friends always had on every occasion experienced from the honest and independent freeholders of Tralee * * * If the people of Ireland were to meet the Liberator's annual rent a little more cool, and were I to be less active, and less zealous in collecting this impost of his, perhaps they and I might meet with a better reception at Derrynane. I state nothing in this letter but what I can really and honestly prove."

Here let us make a reflection or two on this transaction. In the first place, those gentlemen in Tralee knew Shanahan well, and the wretched state to which he was brought for the good of the church. Secondly—They considered Daniel O'Connell, then in Derrynane, as the only man living who ought to relieve him, or if not, to give him advice or authority to get relief elsewhere, namely, out of the fund for supporting the election. Thirdly—They used every argument they could—what they said was without " hesitation"—the losses sustained—the manner in which he treated the opposite party—how he influenced his relatives and others—and they go so far as to say " we think the refusal of some assistance would be productive of very evil consequences," besides that Shanahan is truly an object of pity. The result of all this on your father's hard and callous heart is now before the public. True it is, he shapes his reply, as if it expressed the indignation of a patriot. But what did he here repel ? The rent or tribute which this man formerly collected ? No, verily, he would not have refused a communication made to him in that shape ; but he sent the man away with feigned indignation against the shape of his application, leaving him and his friends of the Chamber of Commerce to ruminate on the import of the term shape, while he kept the money in his pocket, and let the man go starve or beg. He knew well, that on refusing those gentlemen as he did, he could not lose their support—that this would involve their consistency and especially their religion, if they turned against him—he thought the transaction also, never would become public, and then it was but another bubble on the stream of ingratitude which naturally flows from his heart. Like an old beggarman, whom I once heard say—" Madam, I am an independant man ; for if you do not help me, there are fifty in town who will," he could afford to be ungrateful, and even indulge his natural impudence to the very men who had served him. His reply, however, was a most ingenious one. I will translate it for you, as you kindly did the phrase " Kerry Election" for me :—' I should consent to resign the begging box, to have the collectors dismissed, never to have another lying speech uttered from the altar, to excite such beggars, even as Shanahan, to

contribute to the justice rent, and to have my family and self excluded from parliament, aye, and even to run the risk of having our perjury, as it concerns the oath we took respecting the Protestant establishment, for ever unremitted by the true church, rather than, after I have received money to work for her interest, to have it taken from me in this shape, by even the Vicar-General of the diocese." I am afraid, sir, there is something of the infidel still in your father. It is a well known fact in Tralee, that, after he returned from St. Omers, when a young man, he, out of contempt for popery, threw his aunt's manual or prayer book into the fire, and burned it. He made summary work with St. Peter, the Virgin Mary, the Angels, and all the train of Popish mediators. In addition to this, I have heard it stated, that at that time, he was quite in a swither, as the northerns phrase it, whether he should come forth at the bar as a Protestant or a Papist. Pope Leo X., who denied the being of God, said once to Cardinal Bembo, "This fable of Jesus Christ has done us good service?" and so your father may say to you as it regards the fable of Popery. It is no wonder, then, that he receives priestly absolution every day; for he is better paid for his infidel submission, than any priest in the world is for imposing on mankind. I should be much inclined to think, that before he wrote the lying letters about John Wesley and his doctrines, he must have got at least a month's indulgence before hand, that by the help of lying Father O'Leary's forged letter he might blaspheme the Bible, villify the dead, abuse the living, trample on all decorum, vomit out whole paragraphs of wilful, deliberate, and crude lies, and thereby give quiet advice to the secret society of ribbonmen to stab, shoot, or murder the Wesleyan ministers and people as they have done those of the Established Church in Ireland. I do verily believe, that he is near his fall—that the iniquity of this Amorite is nearly full; and that the nation may be on the look out to see this Haman hang on the gallows which he has erected for his unoffending neighbours. "Verily there is a God that judgeth in the earth."

In conclusion, I must notice an important part of your letter. You say, "He would have allowed this poor peasant at the bidding of any landlord, to have prostituted his conscience for the base motive of worldly lucre. The freedom from perjury of the man's immortal soul did not interest him; it is only into the condition of his breeches' pocket that Mr. M'Afee condescends to inquire." This language is rather obscure. I must make it plain. Let it be rightly understood, and the very main spring of popery will unfold itself, suspended with all the evils which distract our unhappy country. Apply it now to Shanahan's case, and from it we develope the ruling principle which actuates the whole of the priesthood and demagogues through Ireland. Shanahan promises his vote to the Knight of Kerry, and thereby acts in accordance with the wishes of a good and indulgent landlord. Hereby his judgment, his circumstances, and the natural tie which subsists in civil society all combine; but the priest in the mean time steps in, threatens damnation, tells him he is violating his sacramental vows, frightens him with purgatory, refuses him absolution, and shews him he will be guilty of perjury against his church, if he votes against Maurice O'Connell; and thus succeeds in leading him to his ruin, and finally to the ruthless repulse of your ungrateful father; and now you come forward to justify such conduct, and tell the British public that

Shanahan, your father, yourself, and all the papists who are returned to parliament would be guilty of perjury, if you did not endeavour, with might and main, to give ascendancy to your religion in all things. This is the very spirit of what you have now stated. Here now is a striking instance of what you mean by freedom of conscience; it is a liberty to break every natural tie of civil society for the purpose of giving ascendancy to popery; it is the liberty of violating the parliamentary oath of honest God-fearing, confiding Protestantism, to keep another directly opposite, imposed by the church of Rome. To break the latter is perjury—foul black perjury; to violate the other is but a venial sin, which even a hedge priest could rub out, as easily as a boy at school cleans his slate! Let the public now judge of your folly in meddling with this case: and say whether I have not proved the black-hearted ingratitude of your father to "one of the finest peasantry upon the face of the earth." It may gratify many to hear that Shanahan, his brothers and others who knew this case, are now as stanch conservatives as are to be found in the county of Kerry.

I am, Sir, for affording me this additional opportunity of unfolding your father's vileness, your much obliged servant,

DANIEL M'AFEE.

Cork, August 19th, 1839.

TO DANIEL O'CONNELL, Esq., M.P.

Sir—In your second letter to the Wesleyans, there is much of Jesuitical art and aim. One chief object of the whole epistle is to sever the affections of the other great Protestant parties of the empire from their Wesleyan brethren; and hence, by dividing the united strength, you could the more easily effect your aim, in introducing popish ascendancy. Like Sampson's foxes, you came in with a fire-brand at your tail, and the result is, you have burned nothing but yourself. You cannot disturb the union which subsists among genuine Protestants. There is a union of intention, of feeling, and of exertion, which you can never destroy. It is not the union of darkness—of a mere grave-yard—like that which pervades the serfs of your church, whose right of private judgment lies buried at the door of your chapels. Every Romanist drowns it in the stone basin of holy water, as he enters the sanctuary of infallible imposture. All true Protestants think and let think—they all stand on the one foundation, which is Christ Jesus—they are all included in the Catholic circle of Christianity—separated in their parties, it is true, by minor shades of difference, but still regarding Christ as the centre. This true Catholic ground is not occupied by your church. She finds another centre in Antichrist, who has been blasphemously styled by some noted sons of the harlot "The Lord God, the Pope." Hence, she belongs not to the Catholic system of Christianity. She dwells in the regions of imaginary traditions, and grossly dark, unscriptural illusions, and vile impostures. She intrudes herself, however, upon our notice, and though grown grey in sin, deceit and error, she would fain make us believe, that she is one, holy, orthodox, and Catholic. In you, she has found an experienced, capitally qualified, and well paid champion. She deserves credit at your hand, inasmuch as she has not sent

you into the warfare at your own expenses. Neither has she permitted you to take the field of controversy without armour. Old Father O'Leary, the laughing Capuchin Friar, left his as a legacy to the Irish Church militant upon earth; and you, finding it to fit admirably well, got it sprinkled afresh with holy water, and behold! you appear as a knight errant against the Wesleyans, and through them against all the Protestants in the empire. Let us glance at the several parts of this ancient monkish, jesuitical, and priestly piece of armour. There is first the girdle of falsehood, which binds the several parts of the dress tight about the loins. Then, there is the breastplate of wickedness, which screens the heart from the influence of righteous principle. The sandals of strife and war are conspicuous upon the feet, and qualify for trampling on the Bible, and treading on those who refuse to support arrogant pretensions. The helmet, is the hope of popish absolution, and of getting safe through purgatory, seeing it is but a venial sin, to deal in untruths for the good of the church, and the establishment of the true orthodox religion. The shield is infidelity, embossed and varnished by the creed of Pope Pius IV. But what is the sword? Not that of the Spirit, which is the word of God, but the old, rotten, rusty blade of traditions, dug out of the rubbish of Popery, and edged on the one side with the grossest slanders, and on the other with the keenest sarcasms; while its point is poisoned with hatred, scorn, and all uncharitableness. Thus accoutred, and armed cap-a-pie in the old Friar's coat of mail, you made your appearance, as you tell us, in your speech delivered at the Corn Exchange to your constituents:—

"Out came the Wesleyan Methodists.—(Loud laughter.) They attacked the measure in a most furious manner, but I came out upon them, and I told these men themselves what multitudes of them did not know a word about; and I told their wives and children what kind of a genius John Wesley, their founder, really was."—(Laughter.)

Certainly, Mr. O'Connell, you did tell us many things about ourselves, and the founder of the Wesleyan Society, which we knew not a word about before. Until you told us, we never knew that we were enemies to freedom of conscience, to civil and religious liberty, and not one of us, nor of our fathers, ever dreamed—nor one in the empire, until you told it—that John Wesley "was one of the principal founders or managers of that Protestant association, which, in June, 1780, raised a rebellion in London." Nor did we know or even dream it, that John Wesley was a Moravian, or an Antinomian, until you told us. The fact is, you are a capital champion for the church of Antichrist. You excel old O'Leary himself, in the invention of falsehood. He did not dare in his day to go just so far. Unfortunate man! This one transaction, has so fixed your character with a wanton disregard for truth, that even your own party will not now believe your declarations, as it respects repeal. They will say within themselves, "He is a repealer for ever, viz.: until the forthcoming contribution is lodged in his coffers."

There were some things, however, which you did not tell your constituents on that occasion. You did not mention one word, Sir, about the challenge which I gave you. You gave no explanation about 1 Tim. iv. 1. 2. not one word. You did not explain to them, how your church stands branded on the very forehead, by the Spirit of God, as being antichrist, because, she *forbids* to *marry*, and *commands* to *abstain* from *meats*. You

never alluded to your heartless treatment of poor *Shanahan*. There was no reply to either of my letters. I glory in your silence. I defy you again before the face of the nation, to explain the passage of scripture now mentioned, or clear yourself in the case of the poor peasant. You say, "Those who entertain most absurd doctrines, shrink from controversy—Catholic truth does rejoice in, and prosper by, calm, temperate, and deliberate controversy." Why, do you now prevent its prosperity? Come out now before the public and let us have a calm and temperate defence. Let no pretence now cause you to shrink from my attack. You said in your first letter you would pay no attention to any anonymous production. Mine is not anonymous; my name is at the conclusion. I did not burden you with many arguments in my first letter. I gave you at least one. Answer that one, and I become a papist on the spot. You cannot. It is impossible; it decides the controversy. Call in the help of Father Maguire, and in the meantime, let me now come to the main point of this letter, namely, to prove, that after all your rant about antinomianism, your church, into whose vile bosom you invited me, is antinomian in spirit, doctrines, practices and members—that she is wrong both in her faith and works—that she is an antinomian by profession and has departed from the law and the gospel in every thing essential.—Never did I undertake an easier task, and I heartily thank you for giving me the opportunity, You say in your second letter, Mr. Wesley asks the question—"What is Antinomianism" and he answers it thus:—"*Its main pillars are, that Christ abolished the moral law; that therefore, Christians* ARE NOT OBLIGED TO KEEP IT—*that Christian liberty, is liberty from obeying the commands of God.*" Keep now to this. We cannot meet on better ground. Antinomianism casts off the law, and claims a liberty from obeying the commands of God. If so, the church of Rome is essentially antinomian, for the following reasons:

1.—She has taken away the *second commandment* and divided the tenth into two, to make up the number. I appeal to her catechisms—to the tablets erected in her chapels in proof of this. You know, Sir, that this is universal. Let us quote the exact words, from the 20th chapter of Exodus. "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments." Now, Sir, I should like to know from you whether a crucifix be the likeness of anything in earth or heaven? Do the people not bow down to it? Did you not bow before one to day? Why does the priest in prayer turn his face to it on the altar? Pray, Sir, is the Host, which is worshipped with the worship of *latria*, or the highest kind of worship in your church, not like something in the heavens above or in the earth beneath? It is certainly not like Christ; and therefore, it is not He; but it is very like another wafer or piece of paste of the same size, and consequently, to worship it, is idolatry. Can you deny this? No, verily. Does not this command represent your popes, priests, and church as haters of God? Does not this account for the visitations of the Divine Being on your church? Why has she been dismembered? Why did the

half of the Roman western empire forsake her communion? Why were the Romanists of Ireland so long in gaining emancipation? Why can you not get corporate reform? Why will you try in vain to get a repeal of the union? Have you not reason to suspect, at least, that God is angry with your idolatry? He visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the third and fourth generation of the children who follow their idolatry. Put away, therefore, your crucifixes and your hosts, and worship God above, through Jesus Christ, and then, and not till then, shall

"Ireland be free.
First flower of the earth, and first gem of the sea."

Surely, your church is antinomian, because she has abolished the second commandment, which prohibits image worship.

II.—Your church, Sir, is antinomian, because she has introduced and established half communion. In this, she has departed from one of the plainest commands in the whole compass of revelation. We have only to quote from the Evangelist Matthew, chap. xxvi. "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and broke it and gave it to the disciples and said, Take eat; this is my body. And he took the cup and gave thanks and gave it to them saying, DRINK YE ALL OF IT; For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Where is now the authority of Christ? It is trampled on by the Church of Rome. The plainest language by way of command is here violated. As she took away the second command from the laity, lest they might not submit freely to her idolatry; so she deprives them of the cup to countenance her blasphemous, foolish, and absurd doctrine of transubstantiation. You, Sir, never received the sacrament of the Lord's supper in your life. You never tasted the consecrated wine, which calls to remembrance the blood, which was shed for the remission of sins In these days of reform and liberality, why do not your priests restore the cup? Are they acting liberally in this to you and the laity at large? Why do you not form a reformation society to remedy the gross abuses of your antinomian church, which claims a liberty from obeying this plain command of Christ? Is it possible for the Saviour of the world to smile on the succession of your popes, bishops, and priests, while they disobey him to his face, substitute their vain inventions for his institutions, mock his authority, and disregard his plainest commands? Here is antinomianism with a witness! And yet you, pious, good man! had a great aversion to pollute your pen by dwelling on those doctrines, which set the commands of God at defiance. If there be a curse resting on any one, that adds to or takes from the Word of God, a dense, dark cloud of vengeance must abide on your church, from the Pope down to the lowest hedge-priest, for taking away the wine in the sacrament, contrary to the express command of Christ.

III.—The antinomianism of your church, Sir, is still more extensively displayed in her taking away the scriptures from the laity. A few quotations will discover the iniquity of this authoritative proceeding.—"And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children," &c. Deut. vi. 6—7. "Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." John v. 39. "And Jesus answering said unto them, do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the scriptures,

neither the power of God." Mark xii. 24. "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither diminish from it." Deut. iv. 2. "Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee and thou be found a liar." Prov. xxx. 6. "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life," &c. Rev. xxii. 18—19.

Now, Sir, there are four things which you cannot deny—1. That your church has taken away the second commandment, and the wine in the sacrament. 2. That she has added the creed of Pope Pius IV. in twelve articles, her vain traditions and ridiculous ceremonies, to those things contained in and authorised by the Scriptures. 3. That she has prevented the circulation and reading of the scriptures in every age and nation, since she became an apostate from the true faith, and especially in Ireland. 4. That the Romanists of this country, and particularly the peasantry, are unacquainted with the word of eternal truth. Why, then, is this the case? The answer is ready: The scriptures would carry light into Babylon, and shew her to be the Mother of Harlots. Your popes, bishops, and priests, are perfectly aware of this. Hence the burning and burying of Bibles, the enmity to scriptural schools, the crusades raised against Bible and Missionary Meetings, the support given by the priesthood to the National Schools, and the aversion shown by millions of our countrymen to anything of a scriptural character. From whence does the hatred of the people arise against the word of God? From the priest—the altar—the confessional. They are fed on the husks of traditions, amused with political harangues, and often become the subjects of bitter taunts and vulgar priestly abuse from the altar, for that very ignorance and ungodly conduct which naturally arises from the want of scriptural instruction. Here is the great curse of Ireland—the antinomianism of the hierarchy. The commandments of God are hidden and broken by wholesale. The peasantry therefore, are ingulphed in wickedness. "Survey the thousands, which now surround you,"—said an old gentleman once to me, in a very large market in the South, as we stood amidst the peasantry, "and nineteen out of every twenty which you see is a rogue and every man a liar." How are we to account for the faction fights, the desecration of the sabbath, the political meetings in chapels on the Lord's day, and even those in Townsend Street, held repeatedly by yourself, while you set an example of iniquity to all the priests and their parishioners throughout Ireland? How are we to account for the ribbon conspiracy, the systematic burnings and murders, which have disgraced our country, the intimidation of witnesses, and the foul, black stain of perjury, which stamps the peasantry generally before the Barrister and the Judges of the land, especially in swearing *alibies*? In fact, it is the natural, and I may almost say the necessary result of popish antinomianism. The people know nothing of the scriptures; they are taught to mock the "Bible Saints;" and their very catechisms not only open the door for lies and petty thefts, but set up the dogmas of a false church above the commandments of God. You, Sir, are well aware of these things; and yet, you had the hardihood to come out before the world as a sworn enemy to antinomianism. Why did you not look behind you before you had the temerity to appear, and thus to be driven back in

disgrace? You creep out of a vile den of heresies—of pollution—and of darkness; and forgetting the hole of the pit whence you issued, you talk as smoothly, piously, and zealously against errors of head, heart, and practice, as if you had come down from the New Jerusalem, instead of proceeding from the house of that harlot, who is the mother of all abominations.

IV.—Have your popes, in conjunction with councils, all infallible forsooth! taken away the second commandment, the wine in the sacrament, and the scriptures from the laity? Then, it is evident, they were antinomian in their opinions and decrees. Let us now see what kind of gentlemen these apostolic successors, these infallible impostors, were, who, in iniquity fairly outdid the Neros, Domitians, and Caligulas of the ancient Roman empire. Their conduct was in perfect accordance with their creed. They not only claimed a liberty to disannul the commandments of God, but they broke them in every possible form. A late author says:—

"It is from the tenth century that we must begin the history of the abominations of the Popes. Pope Formosus died in the year 897. By means of a faction of villains, his seat was filled by one called Boniface, who had twice before been deposed; once while a Deacon and once while a Priest. This Boniface, turned out of the chair by another faction, gave place to Stephen VII., who made himself famous by a remarkable action in causing the body of Formosus to be digged out of its grave, and a process to be made against him upon this pretence, that he had suffered himself to be translated from another bishopric to that of Rome, contrary to the canons; and so his body was thrown into the Tiber. The historians who have written the lives of the Popes, characterize him as a profligate wretch, and make him to have governed only fifteen months. Two Popes followed, of whom the one sat in the chair but four months, and the other only three weeks. After this came John IX., who continued three years.—One Benedict succeeded him on the one hand; whilst a vile fellow, named Sergius, on the other, did also exercise the Pontifical power, as appears by the records of those times. Leo V. followed upon the death of Benedict, who at the end of forty days was imprisoned by another Pope, named Christophorus, who had the chair but seven months. Here are at least seven or eight Popes in that number of years, because they turned out and strangled one another. This Christophorus was turned out by another most atrocious character named Sergius, of the faction of the Marquess of Tuscany. We ought here to peruse the confession of Baronius himself, who entering upon the tenth century, calls it the leaden, the iron age, a century of horror and darkness. At this time ruled those two most notorious strumpets Theodora, a Roman dame, most infamous for her lewdness, and her daughter Marosia, wife to Albertus, Marquess of Hetruria, and concubine of this Pope Sergius, who, at the same time, kept the mother and the daughter, to reward them for raising him to be Pope, by their influence and authority. One Athanasius succeeded him, of whom there is no account. After him came Landos, who to oblige the infamous Theodora, preferred a priest of Ravenna, named John, to the bishopric of Bologna, and afterwards to be archbishop of Ravenna. But Theodora, not finding it for her convenience to have her gallant at such a distance from her, quickly made sway with Landos, and made this John X. by name Bishop of Rome. Some historians say that this John was the son of Pope, Sergius by Marosia, Theodora's daughter. This Pope then, was the son of a Pope, and kept his grandmother to be his concubine. This monster possessed the chair sixteen years, and left it by a violent death; for Marosia, who is reputed by some authors to have been his mother, caused him to be put into prison, and there to be stifled under a bed.—She then made Leo VI. Pope in his room, who survived but six months, and died in prison of a violent death, as his predecessor did. Several who followed in succession had the good fortune to be buried in silence.

"It was otherwise with Octavian, son of Albertus, Marquess of Tuscany, who was made Pope at seventeen years of age. His crimes were very enormous, but they are well known also by the learned word. In him did Rome see another Nero, a second Heliogabalus. The Lateran palace became the most public bawdy-house in Europe; an honest woman could not with any safety perform her devotions in the most public

places, for women were ruined even in the churches. Besides this, he offered incense to the devil, and invoked Jupiter and the other gods of the pagans. This monster in debauchery was deposed by the Emperor Otho, but he formed a party and raised an insurrection, by which much blood was shed. Otho, however, remained master; but on his departure to Germany, the prostitutes at Rome set Octavian again upon the chair, and thrust out the Pope whom the Emperor had made.

"Otho again prevailed; but on his death another wretch who called himself Boniface VII., seized Pope Benedict VI. and caused him to be strangled in prison. Another tyrant of the family and faction of the Marquess of Tuscany, named Benedict VII., turned out this Boniface VII., who was forced to save himself at Constantinople, whither he carried all the moveables and as much of the treasures of St. Peter as he could with him. Some time after, he again returned to Rome, and put himself once more in the chair, in which he found one named John XIV., whom he threw into prison, and then starved to death. Eight months after this, he himself dies and is dragged through the streets to be thrown on a common dunghill. Behold, these are the gods of the Papacy!

"The eleventh century (says Baronius) began with a report which spread itself far and near, that antichrist was come, and that we should soon see the end of the world. It was the horrible villains which had been seen in the church, and which still continued there, that gave occasion to this report. From this period until the middle of the century, the Roman chair was filled with men every whit as vile and monstrous as their predecessors. But the Marquesses of Tuscany disposed of the Popedom as they thought proper, sometimes bestowing it upon their kindred, and at other times selling it to strangers. It was in this century that there was one Pope, but of ten years old, the son of Albertus, Count of Tuscany: he was called Benedict IX., and was one of the vilest monsters that ever sat in the Papal chair, or afflicted the world. Cardinal Benno assures us, that he was a sorcerer, and that he sacrificed to devils in the woods. When this Benedict had reigned peaceably for ten years, another faction of villains created another Pope under the name of Sylvester III.; Benedict then sold his share in the Papacy to one named John, and retired to his house to live in privacy. He, however, returned again in a few months, and once more set himself up for Pope, without attempting to depose the other two; so that Rome had three Popes at one time, in three distinct churches, all infallible, and all acting in opposition to one another! These three wretches might longer have enjoyed the honours and profits of the Papacy if a fourth, more cunning than they, had not persuaded them to part with their dignity in his favour, on condition that they might retain those church revenues which they before enjoyed. This Gratian, for such was the name of this Priest, did not long enjoy the benefit of his purchase; Clement II. took his place; he, however, continued in it but nine months; for, at the end of that period, he was poisoned by Damasus II. who succeeded him. This Damasus, at the end of twenty-three days, was himself poisoned by one Gerard Brazuta, who was kept in pay for such works by the Holy See; for Cardinal Benno tells, that he had poisoned seven or eight successively."

Now, Mr. O'Connell, what think you of these heads of your own *holy*, Catholic, orthodox, and apostolic church? Were they antinomians or not? Bad as you are, do they not put you a little to the blush? Why had you the temerity to invite the Wesleyans or any Protestant party, or any Protestant man, woman or child, into whose nostrils God ever breathed the breath of life, to submit to your church? Pray, Sir, do you think we do not read our bibles, and that we are unacquainted with the history and constitution of the Church of Rome? We know that she contains "the mystery of iniquity," and that every heresy, as well as that of Antinomianism, is found in her doctrines and institutions.

V.—If such be the lives and character of popes, there is nothing extraordinary in the following list of *indulgences, absolutions, and dispensations*, as rated, taxed, and exposed to sale by Pope John XXII., in the Vatican Chancery office in Rome. Platina says of him—"every body knew his life and conversation; he was so immodest and so sottish." There is no

Protestant, Mr. O'Connell, who possesses such advantages as you do. Your church can furnish you with the merits of Christ for one part of your sins—those of the Virgin Mary for another—masses for another—absolution for another—penance for another—and indulgences for the remainder. She has her celestial and her terrestrial treasures; and between the tribute for this life, and masses, absolutions, and indulgences, you cannot, if she be right, (not otherwise) be ill off for the life to come. As she possesses a fund containing the extra merits of all saints, from Adam down, at least, till the time of Father Maguire's birth, and no doubt entertains the high expectation of increasing her surplus at the death of that worthy man—that of John of Tuam, and that of Dr. Murray, according to his merits, as depicted by the Rev. Mr. M'Ghee, together with the present race of Jesuits and Maynooth Priests, with at least the chief officers of the Ribbon Society, she can well afford, from her "celestial treasure," as the Council of Trent terms it, to give such a favourite son as you, a free and safe pass through purgatory; and when you are gone, she can easily gather up the surplus merit of your life, conversation, speeches, and letters, especially those to the Wesleyans—and let the "hereditary bondsmen" enjoy the benefit, in particular those of Tipperary, when any of them are about to pay the forfeit of their lives to the offended laws of their country. Happy man that you are! You can steer safely over the ocean of this life, and never be at a loss for a harbour in the end. You have six points to your compass—the merits of the Saviour, those of the Virgin Mary, masses, absolutions, penances, and indulgences!—Passing over the impossibility, however, of steering to one of these points without leaving the others behind, or on the one side, let us now proceed to our list, and ascertain the great benefits to be derived from these antinomian indulgences. Here are a few of them, with the crime and rate of payment distinctly stated;—

A god-father marrying his god-child,	£ 15	16	4½
An uncle marrying his niece	105	0	0
For committing adultery and marrying the same woman after the wife's death,	11	5	0
A release from perpetual chastity,	2	17	6½
A license to marry after vowing to become a monk	4	8	4
For a Priest to marry, if kept secret,	4	8	4
For simple fornication,	1	19	4
Adultery of both parties, each	1	19	4
A nun (quæ multos homines ad ejus amplexus recepit,) is entitled to all the dignities of her order, and may become an Abbess by paying,	11	5	0
The tax for sodomy is.	11	5	0
If committed within or near a convent or monastery	10	5	0
Pro coitione cum bellua census est,	26	10	3
An absolution from heresy,	11	5	0

For a witch after abjuring her incantations	£ 1	19	2
For murdering a bishop, abbot, or general of any order	15	13	7
For voluntary murder, provided it be secret, a priest, is dispensed with in all ecclesiastical employments for,	9	15	0
If two have combined in the same murder,	15	13	4
If a layman kills a priest the tax is,	1	19	2
If he kills a bishop or abbot	15	13	7
If he kills a layman,	1	1	5
For murdering a father, mother, brother, sister or wife the tax for each is	1	8	8
For each of the accomplices,		10	10
For a license to eat butter, cheese, &c., on fast days,	1	19	9
For an entire family,	4	7	9
For a town and district,	61	6	4
For license to say mass with a wig on,	4	7	9
For *dispensing with the solemn obligation of an oath*,	2	5	11½

Now, Sir, what do you say to this black and iniquitous catalogue? If you attempt to deny its existence in one form or other in your Church, you not only contradict Dr. Challoner in his defence of Indulgences, but the Council of Trent itself. You say at once that your church is *fallible*—that she has lost her ancient power and virtue—you know right well that Luther commenced the reformation by opposing Tetzel, as he sold them for Pope Leo the X., under pretence of a war with the Turks. We are, on this principle, at no loss to account for the perpetration of murder by the Ribbonmen of Ireland, when the united pence of the society can easily procure an indulgence for any of the guilty. The perjury of the peasantry, and even that which has been exhibited in the House of Commons, may now be very easily explained. I have purposely placed this item at the end of the list, and marked it in italics on account of its cheapness. True! money is of less value now, perhaps, one-third, than it was then. On this ratio the 2*l.* 5*s.* 11½*d.* would now be 6*l.* 17*s.* 10½*d.* What signifies this sum to a member of Parliament? It is nothing when compared to the good of the church. I recollect once in the City of Derry, three or four Protestant gentlemen, out of pure compassion for a wandering fellow, clubbed and gave him one pound to carry him home to the county of Tipperary. He went however, to the chapel there on the Sunday before his departure, and it being the day of "the contribution," he gave sixteen shillings of it to that fund, and like a true Tipperary man, resolved to pursue his long journey on the remaining four shillings. Eight liberal souls like this would nearly contribute as much as would now pay for a dispensation for any of the Catholic gentleman who are honoured with a place in the Senate, and stand charged before the empire, at the same time, with the violation of that comprehensive and definite oath, which they took in relation to the established church. When the holy, infallible, and apostolic church, can dispense with a most solemn oath, even in the catholic states, for one-seventh part of the sum which she charges for a man marrying one for whom, he, as a stranger, stood as god-father; there would be nothing extraordinary in her remitting the obligation for nothing at all in behalf of those, who, having taken the oath required by the Reform Bill, only break it for the purpose of giving popery the ascendancy. I have done at present, Mr. O'Connell; and I appeal to the public whether or not you acted wisely in lifting your pen against antinomianism. You branded the monster as a heresy; and I have proved your church to be the mother of it.

I am, Sir, for the opportunity afforded me of unfolding a little of the Mystery of Iniquity, your most obliged servant,

Cork, September 6th, 1839. DANIEL M'AFEE.

TO DANIEL O'CONNELL, Esq., M.P.

Sir,—In my first letter I briefly investigated your public conduct; in my second I furnished ample, and I apprehend complete, evidence of your cupidity; and in my third I gave a true picture of your antinomian church. She still stands, with two pillars in front;—On the one is written in capitals, by the finger of God himself, "Forbidding to Marry," and on

the other, "COMMANDING TO ABSTAIN FROM MEATS." By this the edifice stands distinguished from the one, holy, living temple of the true church. No man who acknowledges the bible can mistake her, except he be a liberal, who from some interested motive or other is purblind, and inspired with a false charity, that leads him to overlook the truth of God. As the Divine Spirit has stamped Apostacy—a complete and entire departure from the faith—on the portals of this mysterious edifice, let us enter the interior, and try if there be any thing within which redeems the character, and leaves even the semblance or rudiments of a Church of Christ. I wish now to enter in company with you. On this occasion I intend to stick close by your side; and I hope, before we part, to make your reason blush, and your prejudices wish that I had been one of Pharaoh's horsemen who were drowned in the Red Sea. See, there is one of her priests engaged in the ceremonies of the Mass. He is just about to consecrate the Host. A piece of parched paste, or bread, lies before him. He pronounces the words, *Hoc est corpus meum,* ("This is my body,") and in the twinkling of an eye the whole substance thereof is changed into the body, blood, soul and divinity of our Lord JESUS CHRIST! This is truly miraculous indeed! In your second letter to the Wesleyans you profess your belief in this dogma thus: "I believe, with the *certitude of faith,* that what you call the dogmas of popery are *perfectly true*, and *conducive to eternal salvation.*" Again, in your Address to the People of England, you wish for a "calm, cool, and deliberate investigation into the nature of the tenets in which the Catholics really believe, and into the arguments and the authority upon which the tenets are received;" and then forsooth, you tell us, that when St. Austin arrived in the Isle of Thanet, in the year 596, being sent by Gregory the Great—the same Gregory who in one of his letters declared, that whosoever claimed the title of Universal Bishop, would be the forerunner of Antichrist—that this Austin "celebrated mass—invoked the saints—he prayed for the dead—he brought with him relics of dead saints—he administered the seven sacraments of the Catholic Church—and in short, he was in every thing a catholic, just as we are at the present period." Now, Sir, without stopping at present, to enquire into the truth of this statement—without waiting to prove that this same Austin found christianity already embraced; and that he only came to corrupt those who adhered to it, by his novelties; and to prove that, in the year 603, he instigated Ethelfride, the Pagan king of Northumberland, to make war against the Cambrians, and to murder the Abbot of Dianoth, with twelve hundred of his followers, in the most cruel manner; or, without delaying to shew, that he had indeed one chief characteristic of popery, namely, a diabolical spirit of persecution, I proceed from your own words, to reason with you as a believer in transubstantiation. In this extraordinary tenet of your church is contained the very essence of all her pretensions and absurdities. Here is infallibility—priestly authority and power—a denial of the right of private judgment—a renunciation of the senses—infinite energy and perpetual miracle—the whole virtue of the mass—the benefit conferred on the living and the dead—the instrumentality which delivers from Purgatory, and in fact the royal mint of the Church of Rome, which enriches her priesthood, and sends forth a circulating medium, which keeps her trade in

prosperity, and binds the whole system together. To this I would now direct especial attention; it is the key-stone of the arch, and as I am certain I can demolish it, it is evident that in the eye of reason the whole system must come tumbling down. Away then goes the altar and the priest, and the censor, and the incense, and the mass, and the idolatrous worship of the host, and prayers to saints, and purgatory, and confession, and penance, and pardons, and indulgences, and congregations, and collections, and yearly tribute money, and agitations, and speeches, and plots, and schemes—and you, Sir, will stand stripped of one argument in favour of your religion, and be laughed at by every man in the community, who for a moment exercises his common sense, unless you turn Protestant, and flee from this Babel of confusion and lies. Come now Mr. O'Connell, I will make a fair bargain with you—the public are witnesses—that if I fail to show transubstantiation to be a monstrous falsehood, and the worship of the host to be rank idolatry, I hereby propose that in your chapel at Derrynane, I will read my recantation publicly on any Sunday which you may appoint, with the exception of the one on which the tribute is collected, as I never intend under any circumstances, to give a farthing to that, on account of your conduct to poor Shanahan; and on the other hand, if I succeed, you are to come to this City, and before Dr. Kyle, the Lord Bishop of Cork, (if his Lordship can put confidence in you, that you would act sincerely,) you are publicly to read your recantation from Popery in the Cathedral, and acknowledge that since the day you were in doubt whether you should go to the bar as a Protestant or Romanist, you have been blindly, and corruptly, and wantonly abusing the Protestant faith and community at large. Now, Sir, will you stand to this proposal? I know you might make some objections:—First, because you wrote a letter in favour of Transubstantiation several years ago, in reply to the Rev. Robert Daly; Secondly, because you might feel unwilling to leave the tribute behind you; Thirdly, because you might be justly afraid of the Ribbonmen; and Lastly, because you know the Priests would abuse and villify you, and expose all your secret iniquities and intrigues. But recollect, Sir, what you say to the people of England. "The matter in question is of the most vital importance; it relates to the truth of God, and it involves an eternity of suffering or of happiness." These are weighty words indeed. I hope you will consider them well. I have not the slightest doubt of succeeding. If so, let no earthly consideration prevent your embracing the truth. What is the yearly contribution to you a man now advancing in years, in comparison of "an eternity of suffering?" The Protestant press will defend your future conduct, if you be only sincere, and if you be afraid of your life, you have only to remove to the province of Ulster, and spend the remainder of your days among the Churchmen, Presbyterians, and Methodists there. You know very well that the celebrated Dr. Doyle died a Protestant. Follow his example, then, by yielding to the arguments now about to be adduced. As you wish for authority, I must now comply, and state your belief in this dogma from the Council of Trent. In Session XIII. chap. 3, 4, 5, and canons 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, with Session XXI, chap. 1, 2, the infallible Council declares your creed on this point thus:

1—"That by the *consecration of bread and wine*, a *conversion is made* of the *whole substance* of the *bread* into the *substance* of the *body* of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, and of the *whole substance* of the *wine* into the *substance* of his *blood*."

2—"If any one shall deny that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there are contained *truly, really*, and *substantially*, the *body* and *blood*, together with the *soul* and *divinity* of our LORD JESUS CHRIST; or say that *he is in it only as in a sign, or figure, or by his influence*, let him be accursed." (Anathema sit.)

3—"If any one shall deny, that in the adorable Sacrament of the Eucharist, *whole Christ* is *contained* in *each element* or *species*, and in the *separate parts* of *each element* or *species*, a separation being made, let him be accursed."

4—"If any one shall say, that all faithful Christians ought *either* from the *precept* of *God*, or from the *need* of *salvation*, to receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist in *both kinds*, let him be accursed; and if any one shall say that the *Holy Catholic Church* has *not* been *induced* by *just causes*, to *communicate* it to the *laity* and the *non-officiating clergy* in the *species* of *bread only*, or to *have erred* in *that respect*, let him be accursed."

5 "This Holy Council teacheth, and openly and simply professeth, that in the pure and holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our LORD JESUS CHRIST, true God and man, truly, really, and substantially, is contained, *under* the *appearance* of these *visible things:* nor are these matters *self-contradictory*, that our Saviour *himself* always *sits* at the *right hand* of the Father *in Heaven*, according to the *natural manner* of *existing;* and that, notwithstanding, *He* is in *many other places Sacramentally present* to *us*, with *his substance*. There is, therefore, no *room to doubt* but the *faithful* of Christ *should adore* his most holy Sacrament, with that *highest worship* due to the *true God*, according to the *constant usage* in the Catholic Church. Nor is it the *less* to be *thus adored*, because it was instituted by Christ our Lord to *be eaten, (ut sumatur.)* If any one shall say, that this holy Sacrament should *not* be *adored*, nor *solemnly carried about* in *procession*, nor *held up publicly* to the *people* to *adore it*, or that *its worshippers are idolators*, let him be accursed."

These dogmas are confirmed in the creed of Pope Pius IV. After pronouncing this to be the "True Catholic Faith, without which it is *impossible* to be *saved*," he concludes it with this commination, "Let *no man* therefore, *dare to attempt the breaking of this, our deed and injunction, or be so desperate as to oppose it; and if any one presumes on such an attempt, let him know, that he thereby incurs the wrath of Almighty God, and of his blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul.* Given at Rome, in St. Peter's Church, Nov. 13, in the year of our Lord 1564, the fifth of our Pontificat."

Now, Sir, as Solomon tells us, "the glory of man is his understanding." God hath endued us with reason, as the noblest of all faculties; we are bound to exercise it, simply because he has given it. You have done it in law and politics, and why not now in religion? While we keep within the circle of nature and revelation, we can never be wrong. All false philosophy is a departure from nature—that is, from things as they are; and all false religion is a departure from revelation, or the truth which God has been pleased to reveal. Your church disallows the exercise of reason, except in finding out her infallibility, and when we fancy we have found it, we are to bury our reason in the chapel yard, and never use it until our bodies are laid along with it in the same grave. Reason is the bright eye of the soul, which moving on the axis of intellectual power, turns in every direction to analyze, combine, compare, and judge of every thing that nature and revelation exhibit to its view. I come now to exercise mine for a little in analyzing the doctrine of transubstantiation. The word is compounded, as every school-boy knows, of *Trans*, over, and *substantia*, substance, or matter; and hence means the *passing* or *change of one substance* into *another*. It is of real Latin origin, and belongs exclusively to the Latin Church. The parts are simple in themselves, but mysterious in their union. Mystery has spread her wings over this compound, and hatched it into falsehood, absurdity, blasphemy, idolatry, and everything which is repugnant to reason, religion, and the common sense of mankind. "As

for the meaning of a word," saith Dr. South, "that may shift for itself; and as for the sense and reason of it, that has little or nothing to do here: only let it sound full and round, and chime right to the humour, which is at present agog (just as a big long rattling name is said to command even adoration from a Spaniard,) and no doubt with this powerful, senseless engine, the rabble driver shall be able to carry all before him, or to draw all after him, as he pleases." How applicable is this language to the word now in question! Into the sense and reason of it, or the thing expressed by it, millions have never made the least inquiry. Infallibility forbade this. You wish for a cool, deliberate, and calm inquiry, and on this point you shall have it. You profess to believe that "a change is made of the *whole substance* of the *bread* into the *substance* of the *body* of our Lord Jesus Christ." This is the simplest view with which we can begin. Let me now, Sir direct attention:

1. To the essential properties of matter—every material substance is invested with certain properties or qualities, some of which are primary, and without which it cannot be supposed to exist, and others which are secondary. The primary qualities of every material substance are—1, Solidity. 2, Extension, including length, breadth, and depth. 3, Figure 4, Gravitation or weight. 5, Divisibility. 6, Motion or rest. The secondary qualities are colours, sounds, tastes and odours. No particle of matter however small, or body however modified, can possibly exist without the primary qualities already enumerated. Thus a stick of sealing wax may, by the operation of fire be rendered liquid or reduced to smoke and ashes; and when it has undergone these changes, it loses not one of the primary qualities in its smallest particles, though the secondary ones may have been altered or destroyed. Let these remarks be distinctly understood.

II. The body of Christ was certainly material. It possessed all the primary qualities of matter at his birth, resurrection, and ascension up into glory; and though now it is what is termed a spiritual body, it must still necessarily retain those qualities, however refined and assimilated to a spiritual state of existence. It cannot have lost any of the essential properties which it once enjoyed, or else it would cease to be his real body, nor could our material bodies at the resurrection be said to be made like unto his glorious body. As Christ assumed or took unto him a real body so it had an identity—an individuality distinct from every other body and particular substance. Let us note the following properties, essential to it *alone*, and exclusive of every other individual thing—It *alone* was conceived of the Holy Ghost—was born of the Virgin Mary—was baptised in Jordan—was transfigured on the Mount—sweat blood in Gethsemane's garden—was crucified on the cross—was buried in the new tomb—arose from the dead—appeared to his disciples, when he said "Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see me have"—and it *alone* ascended up into heaven, and according to St. Paul's declaration, "Sat down for *ever* on the right hand of God." Here are ten things, out of many more, advanced concerning Christ's body, not one of which could be asserted of any one composition of matter in existence, but of that which constitutes Christ's body alone.

III. The wheat, flour or bread, which is said to be changed into Christ's

body, is as certainly material as any thing in existence. It has all the essential properties of matter; but has it one individual property which distinguishes Christ's body from every other particular substance in existence? Observe the origin and process of that which composes the wafer or host. A farmer, perhaps an *heretical* one, sows wheat; it springs up, ripens, and is cut down; and after being paid as tithe to an heretical Protestant parson, it is ground, sifted and sold. Part thereof goes to fatten fowl, swine, or human beings, and part is taken, baked, and carried to the altar. There it lies, quite a common thing, unconsecrated and unadored; but the Priest says; "*Hoc est corpus meum*," and in one instant it is converted into the body of Christ: it becomes the identical Son of God! As it is now consecrated and lies there in the form of a wafer, pray Mr. O'Connell, do you believe that that same thing was conceived of the Holy Ghost 1839 years ago? Was it born of the Virgin Mary? Was it baptised in Jordan? Was it transfigured on the Mount? Did its raiment become white as the light? Did it ever sweat blood in the garden? Was it crucified on the cross? Did it cry out "it is finished!" and gave up the Ghost? Was it dead and buried? Did it arise from the dead and appear to the disciples? Did it say "Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have?" Pray, did it ascend up into heaven and "sit down for *ever* at the right hand of God." If so, how has it come down now? See! there is one on an altar at Derrynane, another at Tralee, another in Limerick, another in Dublin, a fifth in London, and a sixth here in Cork; how did they all come down from heaven, and yet leave Christ sitting at the right hand of God for ever? Do you believe that he has seven bodies and that the seven are but one at the same time? I am sure you cannot and that you do not believe any such thing. It is impossible. You are not a fool. You might as well believe that the North Pole is changed into the South, and the two into one. You might as readily believe that the twelve signs of the Zodiac are all changed into one and that they remain distinct still—that Aries is converted into Taurus, and Taurus into Gemini, &c. and yet they all remain the same as they were before! Transubstantiation is the greatest of all imaginable absurdities.

IV. As such an astonishing effect is produced by the words of consecration, *hoc est corpus meum*, let us examine into their virtue on this occasion. The Evangelist tells us that our Lord "took *bread* and *blessed* it, and *brake* it, and said, take eat; *this is my body*." Here, Sir, you perceive our Lord blesses, or consecrates, before he says, "take eat; this is my body;" that is, our Lord's consecration was ended before that of the Church of Rome commences; for her consecration consists in simply saying "this is my body;" and the instant this is uttered the bread ceases to be bread and becomes the body of Christ substantially without sign or figure. Observe then, the following things. 1. That the Church of Rome, not using the same words which our Lord used, cannot produce the same effect, for suppose he did change the bread into his real body, she cannot; because she does not use the same words in consecration. 2. That as the unconsecrated wafer lies before the priest, and as he does not consecrate it as our Lord did, it follows that when he says, "this is my body," that he pronounces a piece of unconse-

crated bread to be the body of Christ. 3. That as every cause must exist before its effect is produced, and if the words "this is my body" must be fully uttered before the bread becomes the real body of Christ, it is incontestibly evident that the Priest, in his unscriptural mode of consecration and change, must pronounce bread to be His body before it can possibly become such. Now, Mr. O'Connell, as you must know something of metaphysics and of philosophy, I appeal to your acuteness on this point. If the change was produced by saying, "this *will* be my body," viz. as soon as the words are uttered, the Church of Rome might make some shew of escape, but as the Priest says of the bread "this is my body," and it cannot be his body until a future instant after the words are uttered, he evidently utters a falsehood in the very words of consecration. Pray Sir, is it bread while the Priest says *hoc est*, "this is? You answer, it must be so, because the consecration is yet unfinished. Is it bread, while he says *hoc est corpus*, "this is body?" You must acknowledge it still is, because the consecration is yet incomplete. Is it bread, while, he says, *hoc est corpus meu*? You must confess it is, because a certain portion of time is just necessary to pronounce the final *m*, in order to complete *meum*, or "my," as a certain portion is necessary, in order to read a paragraph. Now, suppose the priest took five minutes to pronounce every letter in the sentence, *hoc est corpus meum*, I should wish to know, whether the wafer be partly changed into the real body of Christ, before he utters the final *m*? If any change has taken place, how far does it extend? If no change is yet effected during the five minutes, that the letter *m* is not uttered, does it not follow, that the whole virtue of the consecration is lodged in that letter? If so, the priests, henceforth, have only to pronounce the letter *m*, and the wafer is at once changed into the body, blood, soul, and divinity of the Saviour of the world! But the priest has now uttered every letter, and the very instant he did so—observe the very instant and not till then, the change took place; and hence, it is evident, that according to your own creed, he had completely, really, and absolutely pronounced bread, and nothing else, to be the body of Christ, and consequently, transubstantiation being effected by a lie, we cannot expect much good to result from it. Can a lie in the consecration produce the sanctified body of Christ? No doubt you will agree with me in saying it cannot, and hence, when the priest after this process, holds it up saying, "*Ecce Agnus Dei qui tollit mundi peccata*, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world"—and when the whole congregation fall down to worship it, with the highest worship due to God, according to the Council of Trent, do they not worship a piece of bread consecrated by a falsehood? Pray, Sir, is not this idolatry? If not; what is it? The priest in this case utters no consecration prayer; he only pronounces the thing to be so. He says, let there be light, and he would make the world believe it shines at his fiat. To pray would not be consistent with this creator——of Gods. He acts as if he were Christ, and hence his consecration and his mighty conversion of bread into body, must just be according to his fancy—a vile, blasphemous conceit; for the host is just as much the priests body, as it is the body of Christ. Behold in this, the chief trait in the character of the Man of Sin! He exalteth himself above all that is called God. Our Lord at the last supper, could not change the bread which he held in his hand into his own natura

body; because the existence of his body prevented the possibility; but the priest pretends to do, what he could not; and hence, he places himself above Jesus Christ.

Pray now, Mr. O'Connell, do you believe in this dogma? Do you believe the priest can do what Christ could not—that his false consecration effects more than Christ's blessing did? You say you do. Hold, Sir! you only say it, and say it because you fancy it. Your imagination and will are concerned in the matter: your understanding has nothing to do with it. Let St. Paul now speak to you; hear him for once. Speaking of the Man of Sin—of the succession of host-makers, he says of those who profess their faith in such absurdities—"They received not the *love* of the *truth* that they might be saved. And for *this cause* God shall send them *strong delusion*, that they should *believe a lie*." If you do not believe this absurdity, what shall we say to your professions? If you do believe it, you are then deluded by the just judgment of God, who often punishes one sin by another. How simple is the institution of Christ! The bread and wine of the sacrament are consecrated as a joint token, figure and commemoration of his broken body and shed blood for the sins of mankind, until his coming again; but your church, Sir, has separated, altered and destroyed this holy ordinance for the vilest purposes of priestcraft—that she might have masses for the living and the dead—that she might have masses for sick men, aye, and even for sick animals—that she might say masses for a good draught of fishes, as you know is done, for instance at the river Loun, not far from yourself, when the fishermen club and pay the priest for celebrating a mass in their behalf. This is done regularly every season. Is not this selling Christ for so many pieces of silver? what pretensions, then, I would ask, has your church to belong to christianity at all? Since the year 1216, when transubstantiation was finally established by the Council of Lateran, she totally renounced christianity and confirmed her recantation in the Council of Trent. According to this cursing council, she has not the sign, or figure of Christ's body—she curses all who believe this; and according to common sense, to reason, and to scripture, she has not the substance of his body, and therefore, being destitute of both sign and substance, she is not of the Church of Christ. Hence she has no authority, no ministerial succession, no commission from God. She is a complete and total apostate. God has branded her so in the very front—"Mother of Harlots"—Forbidding to marry, commanding to abstain from meats." Here are her characteristics as a church. Individuals within her pale may hear or read the truth and of course be saved, but it is not by her priesthood or sacraments this comes; for she has none. Transubstantiation is the internal, mystical, and doctrinal mark of a total departure from the faith, the same as those mentioned are external and evident to every one.—Thus she mocks Christ in pretending to make him, runs from him by trying to bring him near, debases him by idolatrous honour, degrades him in the elevation of her host, destroys the hypostatic union between his divinity and humanity by uniting him to millions of parched cakes at the same time, denies the virtue and merits of his sacrifice by making a repetition of it, contradicts his Spirit, which says, "he sat down for *ever* at the right hand of God," by pretending to bring him down upon thousands of altars, and in fact, causes him to be received into the

mouth instead of the heart; and thus makes the muscles of a man's jaws become a substitute for believing, and thereby renounces the doctrine of salvation by faith, and destroys the terms of the new covenant. The truth is; this abominable tenet transubstantiates everything connected with it. It turns sight, feeling, taste, and smell into faith, by making a man believe Christ is present in the wafer, contrary to the evidence of sense; it turns faith into sight by exhibiting him to the eye, who can only be viewed by faith; it resolves reason into imagination, and imagination into absurdity, and the belief of a lie; while it changes love into hatred of all who call the worship of the Host idolatry, and transforms zeal into a fierce devouring flame of persecution, against those who adhere to the reason, sense, and the simplicity of the scriptures.

I must now conclude this epistle, Sir, although I have by no means finished my argument on transubstantiation. I will return to it in one letter more at least.—In the meantime praying, that what I have now written may inspire you with a desire for hearing more on the subject, and may tend to open the eyes of thousands of our deluded countrymen.

I am, your obedient servant,

Cork, September 19th, 1839. DANIEL M'AFEE.

TO DANIEL O'CONNELL, Esq., M.P.

Sir.—A Writer calling himself "Charles O'Connell," appears in your behalf against me in the columns of the *Cork Standard* of Wednesday last. What or who he is I cannot tell, but I suppose he fancies there is some kind of talismanic virtue in the name, that will either frighten me out of the field, or divert me away from you. He is mistaken, Sir, in this. I object to enter the list with this person for the following reasons:—1, because his name is *Charles* and hence he is but a mere *pretender* and intruder on this occasion. What business has he to interfere between you and me? Has he not brains enough to conclude, that when you are afraid to come forward, he will have but small chance of success? 2, The calibre of his fire-arms is too diminutive for me either to dread or to meet his attack; it is but a mere pop-gun, not much larger in the bore than the big O which stands before his name. 3, I apprehend that the muzzle is spiked, and if he be let alone he will soon fall by his own weapon, childish as it is. 4, In the volley that he has fired there is nothing but smoke; there is no strength of thought, no power of reason, no point or force, and his letter reminds me of a beggar's cloak, made up of shreds and patches. Had it not been for the borrowed powder he could scarcely have heard the report of his own gun. I am obliged to this boyish antagonist, however, for one question which he asks—namely, "What is a Protestant?" The answer to this will conclude my introduction to this letter, and bring you and me at once into argument again on transubstantiation.

An old countryman in the north of Ireland once said to a person in my hearing, "Do you know what the old popish wives now say through the country?" The other replied, "I do not." "Well then," said he, "they say that God Almighty is a Protestant." Being struck with the peculiarity of the declaration, I enquired, "why do they say so?" He said, their

reason for thinking so was this—that a great many plots and schemes were got up among them, time after time—the Protestants knew nothing of them, not being admitted into the secret—the thing was always discovered —the Romanists would not tell on themselves—it must be the Almighty that told it; and therefore, they inferred that he must be a Protestant." However quaint and unique this assertion may appear, I think its truth is evident from better premises. We can only know His will by His Word. He that inspired his apostle John to write, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partaker of her sins," must surely be a Protestant, or one that protests against Popery. St. Paul was one, for he wrote, "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron. FORBIDDING TO MARRY, AND COMMANDING TO ABSTAIN FROM MEATS." St. Peter was a Protestant, for he wrote, "There is none other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved, but the name of Jesus Christ." He discarded all idea of popish mediators. The great multitude of the saved before the throne are Protestants, for one of the Elders said, "These are they which came out of great tribulation and *have washed their robes* and *made them white* in the *blood* of the *Lamb*." All these protest against justification by works instead of faith—against penances, priestly absolutions and purgatory. The angels of heaven are Protestants; for they sing before the throne, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and glory, and honour, and blessing," and hence they abhor idolatry and saint-worship. Every man on earth, who holds Christ alone as the head of his Church, and receives the Scriptures as the infallible rule of faith, is a Protestant. Thus you see, Mr. O'Connell, there is a goodly number of Protestants in the wide empire of existence. There is not the slightest doubt of the ultimate triumph of Protestant principles. Every creature in the visible or invisible world, who unites with God in his testimony against idolatry, superstition, ignorance of the scriptures, salvation by works, purgatory, which detracts from the merits of Christ's blood, is a Protestant; and all who refuse to do so are enemies to Him, to heaven, and to true religion. Whether you and your compeer—the "pretender" be on the side of heaven or not, let the public judge. Let us now turn our attention to transubstantiation and develope the mysteries of this absurdity a little more.

When Cardinal Perron was asked by some of his friends in his last sickness, what he thought of Transubstantiation? He replied, "it is a monster." And when they enquired how he came to write so learnedly and copiously about it? He answered, "that he had done the utmost which his wit and parts had enabled him, to color over this abuse and render it plausible; but that he had acted like those who employ their whole force to defend an ill cause." Innumerable writers and speakers have done the same thing. You did it in your letter to the Rev. Mr. Daly. As a jeweller grinds true diamonds to powder, that he may polish false ones with the dust; so the native energies of reason have been employed to defend absurdity. What a pity that this false system of Popery directed reason, from its first rise, into a wrong channel. The madness, the silliness—the

imbecility of reason is exhibited more in embracing and defending transubstantiation, than any other dogma of the Popish Church. In my last letter, I proved to the satisfaction of every enquiring mind, that our Lord's natural body having all the known properties of matter, had a distinct individuality from any other body—that the wafer, being a distinct individual thing in itself, formed by another process, could not be his body; and that the words of consecration are a falsehood in the very act of utterance. I now, Sir, proceed without further introduction to observe:—

V.—That as the very act of consecration is a falsehood on the principles of the Council of Trent, so it is impossible for the result of this act to be true. The Priest says *hoc est corpus meum*, and in an instant the bread is changed into his body, *without any appearance* of the *change*. Mark the constituent parts of this mock miracle; for a mock miracle it is. 1.—The bread is turned into a true, real, and substantial body. 2.—This body is the natural and glorified body of Christ. 3.—This natural and now glorified body still retains the appearance of bread, the smell of bread, the feeling of bread, and the taste of bread. 4.—This bread in appearance, &c. being the body of Christ, is now seated on the right hand of God, although it is there on the altar. 5.—All the faithful are bound to believe this, under the anathema of the Council of Trent.—Your church, Sir, is a very peculiar one indeed. She must have every thing in her own way, and out of the way of truth. She must have miracles of her own.—This is her standing one. It is like Aron's rod with her, always budding, blossoming, and bearing fruit. It is a perpetual proof of her priesthood, not as successors of the Apostles, but as apostates from the faith. Compare this, Sir, with a true miracle. It is a *sensible, or visible display* of *Divine power* in *performing something* that is either *above* or *contrary* to the *laws* of *nature*, and this is *always done* for the *confirmation of truth*, or for *the glory of God* as the *Governor* of the world. Take the water turned into wine for instance. There was not a change of one substance into another, but of the qualities of water into those of wine. The change was evident to the eye, and to the taste. In transubstantiation there is no visible change whatever. The thing is asserted in opposition to the evidence of sense; and if it be true, those of our Lord and the Apostles must be false. It directly undermines the miraculous evidence of the gospel; it is a solemn mockery of the institution of the sacrament—of the miracles of the gospel, and of the character of God. It is a butment of falsehood for the support of error and corruption. Consider what the thing would be, if a real miracle were wrought. If, when the priest pronounces the words of consecration, the bread was actually changed into the form of a human being, and this appeared evident to the eye of every one in every age, there would then be a real miracle. If, in addition to this, his head and hair were white like wool or snow, his eyes like flaming fire, his feet like burnished brass, his voice like the sound of many waters, and his countenance like the sun shining in his strength, we should then have evidence to conclude, that the bread was really changed into a body like unto our Lord Jesus Christ. But see the wafer after the change! it is a wafer still. It is destitute of the life and animation of a human being, and much more so of the life and immortality of Christ. It has the figure, size, taste, smell and colour of bread. It can neither see, nor hear, nor speak, nor move,

nor walk, nor stand, nor sit, nor elevate itself for the people to worship. I appeal to your conscience, Mr. O'Connell, is it not akin to the idols of the heathen? It differs in form and qualities from those things repeatedly exhibited by Missionaries on their return from idolatrous countries; but, does it not agree with them in senseless incapabilities far more than in its resemblance to the Son of God? If it be a figure of his broken body, then there is no change of substance; and if it be really the Redeemer of the world, how comes it to bear more affinity in its qualities and capabilities to the idols condemned in the Scriptures?

VI.—Suppose, now, Mr. O'Connell, that the priest wrought a true miracle, and actually from the substance of the bread produced a real body in the figure of a man, and like unto Christ in all things; still, that body could not be the body of Christ, nor any other body or substance whatever, but the individual substance of the bread, formed into a new mode of existence.—That such a thing could be effected by the power of God, we can as easily believe, as that Lot's wife was changed into a pillar of salt, the rod of Moses into a serpent, water into wine, or the clay, which our Lord put upon the eyes of the blind man, into the chrystaline humour, or any other part of the eye, where the substance was worn away. All these changes are agreeable to reason; but it would be directly repugnant to reason —to your reason, Mr. O'Connell, or to mine, or even to the reason of a priest, however vitiated from infancy, to fancy that Lot's wife was changed into *another* pillar of salt, which stood on the plain for ages before she was born; or to imagine, that the rod of Moses was turned into *another* serpent, that had a distinct and independent existence of its own. It is very easy to believe, that our Lord turned the water contained in the six pots into wine; but you cannot even fancy, that He changed it into wine contained in six other pots, suppose they stood filled before He wrought the miracle. Changing water into wine, and clay into the humour of the eye which was destroyed, did not imply a change of one substance into another substance; but a mere change of the form and qualities of the same substance. Here, Sir, is the very essence of the error of transubstantiation—the change of *one substance* into *another*, Every material thing is necessarily of one and the same substance, and every individual thing has an identity and individuality, which, is necessarily its own, and, which cannot possibly belong to any other thing existing. The ball A of lead for instance, cannot be changed into the ball B. Suppose both are of equal weight, but the one is a sphere and the other a cube; it is possible to change the one into the shape or figure of the other; but it is absolutely impossible to change the one into the individual substance of the other; for this simple reason, that God has given to each an identity and individuality of its own; and the very existence of each, precludes the possibility. To give a lively illustration.—Because Father Maguire exists, you could not be changed into him, and because you exist, he could not be changed into you. Suppose, however, that Mr. Gregg annihilated his person, as he did his arguments and boasting, and that he ceased to exist, it would be impossible for you to be changed into his substance, because he is an individual substance no more. View this point in every possible form, and you *must* come to the conclusion, I defy your reason to resist it, that the changing of one substance into another, is an actual and absolute im-

possibility in its own nature. It is contrary to truth—to nature—to existence—to the identity of individual bodies, and hence to the wisdom and infinite power of the Divine Being. This you know, Sir, is the *ne plus ultra* of every Jesuit on this subject. God can do every thing, therefore, he can convert the substance of the bread into the substance of Christ's body. The wisdom and omnipotence of God, prevented the possibility of this by giving to each an individual existence. Pray, Mr. O'Connell, could omnipotence make the moon? A school boy will answer, it is impossible,—simply, because he made her already. God cannot work contradictions; transubstantiation involves a contradiction, and an absolute absurdity. Where is it now? The breath of reason blows up the bubble and exhibits the empty absurdity.

Hail infallible Council of Trent, that would damn you or me to all eternity, for not believing an absurdity—an actual impossibility—that one substance could be changed into another substance—that a piece of bread on earth is the identical body of our Lord in heaven! Who can fail in admiring the intellect, the theological information and the deep metaphysical acuteness of those infallibles who composed the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century! Come now Mr. O'Connell, throw aside your gravity and let us have a hearty laugh together at their absurdity. They meet and sing masses, and argue, and plan, and curse, and damn the human intellect to the regions of misery, for not believing a doctrine which confounds unity and plurality, identity and diversity—a doctrine which is an absolute contradiction and impossibility—"the change of the substance of the bread into Christ's body"—a doctrine which amounts to the same thing as if you could be in London and in Derrynane at the same instant—could be fasting in the one place and feasting in the other—could be sitting in the one place and lying in the other—could be standing in the one place and walking in the other—could be healthy in the one place and sick in the other—could be living in the one place and dead in the other; and that wishing to visit your own self and devise some new plan for a repeal of the union, you left London for Kerry and on arriving at Cork, you met your own ghost bitterly lamenting the falsehood of popery and the cheat which was put upon your country, and hearing for the first time, that you were dead, you repaired to Derrynane, became chief mourner at your own funeral and had the great pleasure of seeing half-a-dozen *shanamana* (old women) join the procession, and after howling for a while *out of pure grief*, as is not uncommon in Kerry, turning round to yourself and saying, "Pray Sir, do you know who is dead?" This is truly ridiculous and absurd indeed, but not more so than the Trent creed, which you profess to believe —the change of one substance into another.

VII. Consider your faith, Sir, again in another point of view. Give this kelidescope which contains all the absurdities of your church and of human imagination, a new turn; and see what comes up next. In No. 3 of the extract from the Trent Council noted in my last, we read, "If any one shall deny, that in the adorable sacrament of the Eucharist, *whole* Christ is contained in *each* element or species, and in the *separate parts* of *each* element or species, a *separation* being made, let him be acursed;" or as it is expressed in a work entitled, "A profession of the Catholic Faith," that Christ is "*whole* and *entire* under *every particle* as under the *whole*

without being *divided* or *multiplied*, and *without ceasing to be in heaven.*" Now, Sir, if you believe this, and believe it you do, if we receive your profession—and believe it you must, or be subject to the dreadful curse of this cursing Council of your cursing church; it necessarily follows then, that you believe:—

1, In opposition to one of the first maxims of mathematical science—that a part is equal to the whole. Let the wafer, and it can easily be done, be divided into 4, 8, or 16 sections, and as each section contains the body of Christ entire, and as the whole only contains his body, it follows, that any one part must be equal to the whole, and of course, that the one-fourth is equal to the one-eight, and also to the one-sixteenth part at the same time. On the same principle, a quadrant of a circle is equal to the whole circle, Ireland is equal to the whole globe, Kerry county to Ireland, and Derrynane Abbey to the whole county, and in fact to the universe itself. What a strange faith is your's, Sir; it narrows and contracts at pleasure! It sides with or opposes reason and common sense, with the utmost pliability. It is no wonder it makes your arguments like the whims of a hypochondriac. A faith, which leads you in point of principle, to believe, that your toe is as large as your foot, your finger as great as your hand, and that your nose is of equal dimensions with your whole face, is not, to say the least of it, of a very scientific character. But then it is advanced by the Trent divines, and they curse you if you do not abide in it. What pretty philosophers these gentlemen were! The Alchymists were but fools to them. They sought the philosophers' stone in the secrets of nature, and failed to discover it; but the infallibles of Trent found it out in religion so called, for transubstantiation turns all it touches into gold! Let the peasantry of the country act on this principle, that a part is equal to the whole; and in relation to both dues and tribute money, let them transubstantiate sovereigns into shillings, shillings into pence, and pence into farthings, and they will soon rid the country of popery and agitation.

2, By professing this dogma, you equally confound unity and plurality. In the former instance, your creed Mr. O'Connell, destroyed the foundation of all mathematical science, and now it makes an attack on common arithmetic, and even on vulgar fractions. Take care you do not raise up the schoolmasters and merchants of the community against you. See, there the wafer is ready to be consecrated by the Priest. It is now about to be transubstantiated into Christ's body. Now, the change must either be effected on the *whole* at *once*; or else it must commence at *one* particle of the *bread* and so proceed to *another*. If the *whole* be *changed* at *once* into his *body*; then *one* particle cannot possibly contain the *whole body*, seeing that *not* one particle but the whole was changed into his body; and hence it is false to say, "that his body is as entire under one particle as under the whole." If, however, one particle be first changed, and so the change proceeds to the whole; it incontestibly follows—that there was one body of Christ *entire* before the second was changed; and two bodies under the first and second before the third was changed; three bodies under the first second and third before the fourth was changed; and four bodies under the first, second, third and fourth before the fifth was changed; and if according to the infinite divisibility of matter, the wafer be capable of division *ad infinitum*, it would require the application of the fluxionary cal-

culus to determine the number of bodies contained in that piece of paste, and yet after all there is but one body! Forgive me, Mr. O'Connell, for this minute and searching scrutiny into your faith. It is not my wish by any means to trifle with divine things and if I am constrained to mention the body of the Saviour in this manner, let this be my apology that your creed degrades it, and I wish by every legitimate argument to free you and others from this monstrous absurdity.

3. Your faith in this point of view subjects you to a very awkward dilemma. If you renounce it you are cursed by your church; if you continue in it, you must rank with some ancient heretics, and be subject to the curse pronounced on such in the word of God. The Basilideans and Valentians in the time of the Apostles taught that Christ had only the *appearance* of a man; but was not *such* in *reality* being destitute of a true human body. St. John wrote against those heretics, when, he says, "That which we have *heard*, which we have *looked* upon, and our *hands* have *handled* of the word of life." Now, Sir, if the least particle of the bread contains Christ's body, as you believe it does; it is evident, according to the infinite divisibility of matter, that the least possible particle or monad must approach infinitely near to a mathematical point, which is destitute of parts; and consequently, that Christ's body, according to the wise men of Trent is infinitely near to nothing at all! Thus your creed robs the Saviour's body of its proper quantum of matter, its size and dimensions; and places you, the Council of Trent, and every Romanist, with the old heretics, who denied, he had any body whatever. In fact, it would be the easiest task imaginable to shew, that the mystery of Popish iniquity has raked into her creed the heresies of every age from the beginning of Christianity down till the period of the Council of Trent; and that it stands associated by kindred ties with the religion of the ancient Gentiles, the modern Heathens, and that of the false prophet Mahomet.

VIII.—You and I, Sir, must now read a short chapter on *accidents* and *substance*. Here it will be found that your creed is equally repugnant to the philosophy of mind—that we may burn the writings of Locke, Reed, Stewart, Browne, &c., along with the Bible. These have shewn us that we know nothing of substance; but by its qualities—that wherever these are, it necessarily must be. When the wafer is consecrated your creed tells us that the accidents remain; that is, the figure, length, breadth, depth, taste, odour, and colour, of the bread, but its substance is changed into Christ's body. I have proved in No. VI. the absolute impossibility of one substance being changed into another substance. If, therefore, the substance of the bread remain after consecration, the substance of Christ's body cannot possibly be there, and the wafer is bread—still; if the substance of the bread pass away and Christ's body be substituted in its place, it is beyond doubt that the accidents of the bread, which still remain, cannot be the accidents or qualities of his body, it being a distinct substance, and hence, it follows; that the accidents of the bread remain without their substance, viz., there is roundness without anything round, colour without anything that shews it, taste without anything to be tasted, odour without anything odoriferous, length without anything long, breadth without anything broad, depth without anything deep. On this principle we may have birth without anything born, life without anything

living, death without anything dead, and in fact, we may have sickness without anything sick, sight without anything seeing, halting without a leg, poverty without anything poor, begging without a beggar, even when you are dead, an eclipse of the moon without the moon and *transubstantiation without anything changed.*

Observe again, sir, the marked difference between a true and a mock miracle—a miracle of the Church of Christ, and one of the Church of Rome. In a true miracle the *accidents* of the substance are changed, as in the instance of Lot's wife, the rod of Moses, the water turned into wine, and the Nile into blood; in this false miracle the *substance* is changed forsooth into another substance; but the *accidents remain without change.* Now, granting for sake of argument, that the substance of Christ's body is found under the accidents of the bread or of the wine; it will then follow 1, That the body of Christ can be impoisoned; for Pope Victor III. was poisoned in the chalice of the Mass by his sub-deacon, having occupied the chair of St. Peter but ten months. The Emperor Henry VII. was poisoned by the Host; and the same is related by Matthew Paris, concerning Henry Archbishop of York. 2. If Christ's body remain under the accidents of the bread—then his body may fall, may be stolen, may be cast into the mire, may be lost, may become old, may turn stale and mouldy, and, as it is acknowledged by Suarez, may breed worms. 3. If the wine contain his body, being then in a liquid state, it may be spilled or frozen. It may thus undergo a new process and become ice, then be dissolved, and if subjected to the action of fire, be raised to any heat a liquid is capable of sustaining.—Such are the monstrous absurdities of this doctrine. It is decidedly the most absurd which ever was invented by the corrupt imagination of fallen man.

IX.—The Apostle in writing to the Galations—says, chap. iv. 8, "Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by *nature are no gods.*" And in his Epistle to the Romans, chap. i. 25, he says, speaking of the Gentiles, "They *changed* the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four footed beasts, and creeping things." Now ,sir, the consecrated Host stands professedly different from all this, inasmuch, as it is in your creed not an image or idol, but the body, blood, soul, and divinity of the Son of God. The soul and divinity are connected with it to avoid the charge of idolatry. It is a new and distinct species of idol, however, different in several respects from the idols of the Gentiles. Permit me now to ask whether it be God by nature or not? Our Lord Jesus Christ was God by nature, because in His divinity He is of the *essence* of the Father, and is "God of God, light of light." He is God-man by *nature,* because of the hypostatical union of the divine nature with the human. The human nature of Christ never existed one iota of time without union with the divine. It is on this ground he is to be worshipped in his glorious humanity. The worship of the Host is idolatry, because it is not God by nature. This is evident:—1st. Because it existed in substantial form before it could be connected with the divinity. 2. It is professed to be the body of Christ, *not* by *birth* but by *consecration.* 3. The very term "changed" used by the Council of Trent, proves it to be distinct from Christ, "who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever," and classifies it with the idols of the Gentiles,

with this difference, that they, according to the apostle, "*changed* the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image," &c.; whereas the Church of Rome goes beyond them infinitely far in pretending to "*change*" a piece of *corruptible bread* into the *very body* of the *incorruptible God*." 4th. The human soul of Jesus Christ, which in its own nature is simple, conscious, and incapable of division or multiplication, was not united by *nature* but professedly by *consecration* to the substance of the bread. This would be to multiply or divide the soul, to separate consciousness and spiritual essence into parts, or to give Christ millions of human souls, as well as bodies, while at the same time, the soul of Christ can only inhabit one body—that body and soul sat down for ever at the right hand of God—where the soul of Christ is, the divinity is united to it alone, and cannot be united in the same manner to any other soul; and hence, as the consecrated Host, neither contains his body, nor his soul; it cannot possibly contain his divinity; and, therefore, to worship it, is gross idolatry in the sight of God.

Now, Sir, you and your adherents may raise the cry of uncharitableness if you please. It is reason, common sense, and scripture, and not blind charity that is now concerned. What has true charity to do with error but to hate it, and arouse reason to oppose it? You invited me, forsooth! and all the "undignified Wesleyans," as you lately termed us, to join with you in worshipping the Host. Infatuated blindness! Worship it henceforth at your peril! Answer my arguments to the satisfaction of your reason and conscience before you bow to it once more.

In the meantime, Sir, I will reserve my views on the mighty evils and abuse of the human intellect, which naturally arises from the reception of this dogma for my next letter.

I am, Sir, as formerly, your obedient servant,

Cork, Sept. 21*st* 1839. DANIEL M'AFEE.

TO DANIEL O'CONNELL, Esq., M. P.

Sir,—I am credibly informed that you lately applied to a priest in this neighbourhood to furnish you, if in his power, with a copy of Father O'Leary's letters, your own having fallen aside from which you concocted the fine story about Mr. Wesley and the Protestant Association. If the old Friar had possessed as much honesty as would individually have distinguished him from his order, it would have been a happy circumstance for you as a public man, for then he would not have committed the forgery, which now, fifty-nine years after it was issued in the shape of a letter, has proved a man-trap into which you set your foot, and were caught, in no very enviable situation, as a vender of stolen goods, and an utterer of a base forgery. No doubt you wrote your letters to the Wesleyans in high glee, and fancied you were sinking the character of the founder in public estimation for ever; but all this time you did not know your foot was in the trap, until I made the discovery; and on looking down calmly you found it fastened to you, without a possibility of shaking it off. Whether you now hunt upon the mountains, go to mass, drive through the country, visit the Corn Exchange, repair to parliament, or stand upon a balcony to

make a speech in favour of repeal—*alias* the tribute-money—let the populace only look at your feet, and they will perceive you standing in Father O'Leary's trap. Nay, more—Mr. O'Connell, since the 8th of August, on which my first letter appeared, you have stood in the pillory before the nation, bearing the iniquity of O'Leary in addition to your own, which the world knows was great enough without that also of an old Friar on your back. Your friends pity you, your enemies laugh at you, and no one has come to your relief. You have been assailed with facts and arguments as hard as balls of steel, but being encased in the old Friar's armour, you have not yet yielded, or shewn the compunction which might have been expected from a man of such *great candour* as you profess, not to say anything of your *christianity*. Shall we take this application for O'Leary's book as a token of repentance on your part? and may the public expect that, on second thoughts and another perusal, you will acknowledge the fraud, and hold up the memory of the Friar as an object of detestation to every honest heart in the community? I am perfectly sure, Mr. O'Connell, you will do no such thing. Even in the pillory, and with your foot in the trap, if you speak at all, it will only be to reiterate the false charges and justify the crime. If so, you must then rebut the facts and arguments which I have adduced. To take any other course will only plunge you deeper in the mire. You must—1. Shew that O'Leary's letter was no forgery, and then you stand confronted with the testimony of Mr. Wesley:—"The second of those letters is not mine—I never saw it before." 2. You must prove that you treated poor Shanahan with great courtesy and kindness. 3. That FORBIDDING TO MARRY, and COMMANDING TO ABSTAIN FROM MEATS, has not the slightest reference to your church. 4. That she has not taken away the cup in the Eucharist, and the second commandment. 5. That her popes were a race of pious, good men, like yourself and Father Maguire; and that the church was never antinomian, especially in selling indulgences. 6. That transubstantiation is a doctrine of good common sense, reason, philosophy, religion, and scripture. Here is your task, why are you not at it? The reason is plain: you can no more do it, than you could pull down the moon and turn her into a grindstone, for the purpose of manufacturing wafers for your would-be Lord Bishops to consecrate, at the opening of the new Chapel on Pope's-quay in this City. I am here reminded of a curious passage in the writings of Bishop Burnett, which you will forgive the trouble of reading, as it stands associated with the idea of grinding the most unique gods in the universe. "I had a mind to see," says the bishop, "a picture, that, as I was told, is over one of the popish altars in Worms, which, one would think, was invented by the enemies of transubstantiation, to make it appear ridiculous. There is a windmill, and the Virgin throws Christ into the hopper, and he comes out at the eye of the mill all in wafers, which some priests take to give to the people." I should wish very much to have seen this picture—I think I might have suggested an improvement. The artist should have painted the popes as blowing the mill round with their breath, and hence there could be no failure of a sufficient number of deities in a calm day. No doubt, however, but the blind votaries in Worms, admired and venerated this altar-piece, as a most exquisite display of genius in developing the power of the Church. Still there are some suspicions which attach to the

artist. Why did he not depict the priests as casting in wafers and bringing out gods?—Perhaps, he knew this would not answer the designs of priestcraft, seeing, if they were put in wafers they must come out again in the same form; and thus lose the effect of producing impression. I have demonstrated to you, Mr. O'Connell, that what the wafers are in going into the popish hopper, they are just the same in coming out—that there is no change—no miracle—nothing but monstrous absurdity: and now, according to promise, I must finish my remarks on this dogma, by shewing a few results, that necessarily accompany and proceed from it.

1. You are perfectly aware, Sir, that it has involved dispute among Romanists in what department of your church infallibility is concentrated. Some say, in the Pope; others in Councils; many in Councils and Popes united; and some simply in the Church. Here I must agree with the latter, and help them out of this difficulty against their opponents. If by the church we are to understand the body of the faithful—those who receive the Eucharist, it is evident that infallibility is lodged in the whole without exception. The reason is plain, even to a child; for if each recipient in the Church of Rome, receives in the eucharist not only the body and blood, but the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, he or she must necessarily be infallible, and cannot possibly err. Such, therefore, have no need of the Scriptures—nor of the Priest—after the first receptation. You yourself, Sir, must participate in this benefit; and hence, your zeal in endeavouring to convert the people of England to infallibility. This is a short, but sure method of guarding against error in religion. When a man once becomes infallible, he has no need for Scripture, history, philosophy, or reason as a guide in church matters; for whatever he says, must be right and true, although facts and testimony unexceptionable prove the contrary. For instance, you say, in your "Address to the people of England," guided it is true by Judge Halliburton and Miss Martineau —two very competent *judges*, "that *all* the people of the United States, will soon be catholics"—and this *must* be true, because you received the eucharist, and are infallible! although an Almanac published in the States announces only 800,000 Romanists out of a population of better than 14½ millions. Again, you tell us that Protestantism "has lost all expansive power," at the same time, its power of expansion never was so great since the time of the Apostles—witness the Bible, Missionary, Sunday School and Tract Societies. Now, in opposition to this, what you say must be true; for having got the eucharist you are now infallible! The Rev. R. Gleig contradicts the inferrence which you drew from his premises and says, he never advanced the monstrous opinion, which you attributed to him, "that there is no such thing as religious principle anywhere except within the pale of the Romish Church." No matter for this he *must* be wrong, and you *must* be right, for you, having got the eucharist are infallible! Again, you mention six or seven men of note, who according to your statement, are just become converts to Popery; and a writer in one of the London papers proves that some of those are dead thirty years ago. You have the advantage over this gentleman also; and in fact over every one who may oppose you, because having received the eucharist you are now infallible!

2. If a man receives the body, blood, soul, and divinity in the eucharist, he must be impeccable or incapable of sinning, as well as infallible. It is

absurd to suppose otherwise. How can he drop into sin, who has the fulness of the divinity dwelling within him? The Church of Rome therefore must be holy. Hence, it is no sin in her to lie, cheat, swear, or break the Sabbath. It can be no sin in you, for instance, after Mass and Sacrament to listen to the amusing strains of Sullivan the family piper on a Sunday evening at Derrynane. It must delight you most asuredly, and make your Irish heart leap for joy to hear him play, "The green flag flying," and "No king but Charley," as these are known to be among your favourite tunes, even on a Sabbath evening. Such things would be sinful in a Protestant, but in you, with the divinity dwelling within you, sin is no sin—you may act as you please. The eucharist exalts you above rule. Sin and wickedness are virtues in a Romanist, on this principle.

3. According to this abominable tenet, Sir, are not the following inferences perfectly legitimate? Can you deny they naturally and simply arise from the fact that the whole body, blood, soul, and divinity are received by the faithful in the eucharist? Do not fault my reason for making them, but your church for giving me the premises. That as each recipient has whole Christ dwelling within him; so he is equal to the Blessed Virgin, and therefore should pray to her no more—That as each on receiving the eucharist has more of divinity within than an archangel, or any of the first born sons of light, so there should be an end to prayers sent up to angels. That as those who receive are incapable of sinning, let them act as they may; so they are great fools for doing penances, making confessions, and receiving priestly absolution, seeing each is as great, as holy, and as infallible as the priest.—That as the stomach is more immediately in contact with the Divinity within, each Romanist may be looked upon as a living temple of Deity, and this function of the human frame, may be considered the most holy place, being typified by the *sanctum sanctorum* in the temple of Solomon. That as the *veronica*—a handkerchief on which it is believed Christ imprinted the likeness of his face before his ascension was worshiped with the worship of *Latria;* so you, the priest, or any other Romanist, is more worthy of the same worship, being the highest in your church, because the body, blood, soul, and divinity are within, when once the eucharist is received. Can you deny these conclusions? Not if you believe transubstantiation.

4. This extraordinary piece of absurdity is more degrading to Christ, sir, than any other of the popish inventions. It is a direct reflection on his personal attributes and glory. It debases him in a manner not only offensive to piety and reason, but to the native delicacy of humanity. To prove this it is only necessary to quote from the Mass-book revised by Pope's authority. There is, in the commencement, a treatise on the defects that happen in the mass where these rules as stated by Du Moulin are found in the third chapter.—"If the *consecrated host vanish away by some accident*, as if it be *carried away with the wind or some miracle*, or *eaten up* by *some beast*, and *can't* be *found, then let another* be *consecrated*."—That is if one God be lost make another! Again in the tenth chapter: "If a *fly* or *spider* fall into the chalice, (or blood) and that the *Priest's stomach* rise not *against it*, and *fear not* any *danger* thereby, let him *swallow* the *fly* or *spider* with the *blood*." Again, "If in winter the blood do freeze in the chalice, let the chalice be wrapped up in hot cloths;" and again, "If the

Priest *vomit* up the *Eucharist*, and that the *species* appear *whole*, they *must* be *chewed again* with *reverence;* unless the *stomach should loath them*. For then the consecrated species must be carefully severed, and put into a sacred place, and after that be cast into the shrine wherein relics are kept." On these disgusting and impious extracts let us make the following remarks:—Here the body of Christ is subject to a variety of accident, suffering and action. He who made the wind may be carried away by it.—He who governs all things by the council of his own will, may be subject to the common accidents, that befal a piece of bread.—He may be eaten by a mouse, or any of the meanest reptiles, that he himself created.—He who is always at the right hand of the Father, governing his Church and the world, may be lost and never found.—He who gave the Priest a power to change the wine into his body, blood, soul, and divinity, is so careless of himself, that he permits a spider to fall into his blood, and does not save the poor Priest from the dread of swallowing it.—He, who beams with the highest glory in Heaven, does not prevent himself on earth, from being frozen at one time and thawed at another.—He, who appears on the great white throne, like a Jasper and a Sardine stone—holy and incorruptible, is to descend, if this abominable doctrine be true, into the stomach of a Priest, which from various causes rejects the deity, while his body is "carefully severed" (from what?) and laid up as a *mere relic* with a piece of the Virgin Mary's veil, a toe of St. Thomas à Becket or some trinket belonging to a wicked Pope! Of the absurdity, impiety and blasphemy of this stupid and wicked doctrine, no man can be aware, who has not studied and read on the subject.

5. While this monstrous unnatural, and unholy doctrine, Sir, degrades the Saviour of the world, it tends to exalt the priesthood. It is the power of changing the bread into flesh which makes a priest once a priest for ever. The priest may be a drunkard—a Sabbath-breaker—a political charlatan—a prostituter of the confessional—a tyrant who inflicts a penance on any of his hearers, that from mere civility and neighbourly feeling listen to the service read at a Protestant wedding or funeral—he may never preach but scold—never pray but curse—never give but take—and prompted by his covetousness, may wield the keys of St. Peter with such high authority and threatening, that by the greatest devotees in his congregation, he becomes both hated and dreaded, but after all this, let him only appear at the altar in the fantastic habiliments of his order, and in the eye of superstition and ignorance, he is holy, high, powerful, sacred, and infallible! Why is all this, Mr. O'Connell? The answer is ready: he possesses the mysterious power of turning a piece of bread into the Saviour of the world! By even whispering *this is my body*, he can make his Maker—create his Creator, and frame that body now, which was formed by infinite power, and has substantially existed for better than 1800 years before he was born! By saying that a thing is not itself, but another thing totally distinct, he can work a miracle by the lie, and do what in its own nature is absolutely impossible to be done. Most wonderful and astonishing man! Let us not wrong him, nor misrepresent the power given to the successors of St. Peter. Let us now, hear some of the chief advocates of your church, sir, on this point. Gabriel Biel, in his fourth lesson of the canon of the mass, says—"The *angel citizens* of Heaven *do not aspire* to the *authority*

of the *priesthood*. Christ is incarnate and made flesh in the hands of priests, as in the Virgin's womb, and priests do create their Creator, and have power over the body of Christ." Next comes Peter de Besse. In his book on the Royal Priesthood, he declares—"All priests are kings, in token whereof they wear the crown. The priesthood and the Godhead are in some things to be parralleled, and are *almost* of *equal greatness*, since they *have equal power*. Seeing that the Priesthood walked hand in hand with the Godhead, and that the priests are Gods; it goes far beyond the kingly authority, and priests are far above kings. They are masters of kings, surpassing as much in dignity the royal office, as the soul surpasses the body. Incredible things, but yet true, that the power of priests is so great, and their excellency so noble, that *Heaven* depends on them. Joshua stopped but the sun, but these stay Christ being in Heaven, in the midst of an altar. The creature obeyed to the first, but the Creator obeys to these last, the sun to the one and God to the other, as often as they pronounce the sacred words."

We have now gone far enough, Mr. O'Connell. Let us not wonder at the blasphemy and folly of Biel and de Besse, and say that these things are past and gone. Your church, Sir, is "unchangeable and unchanged;" and the same ignorance, pride, vanity, and blasphemy, still exist among the Irish priesthood, and sometimes boil up like naphtha and become inflamed by their zeal. It is not many years since a priest in a chapel in the county of Galway, on a festival occasion, proposed a logical demonstration of the power of priests, and carried out his blasphemy to as great, if not greater extent than de Besse. He showed that no angel of light, no saint in heaven—no, not St. Joseph or the blessed Virgin, could convert the wafer into the body, blood, soul and divinity of God—that even the great God, great as he is, could not create himself: but, that the priest, by the mysterious power and constitution of things with which he is invested, could on pronouncing the sacred words, create him on the altar. Such notions still exist. They naturally accompany and result from the doctrine of transubstantiation. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Pope at a former period, held out his toe, like a well-bred spaniel, as Swift saith, for an Emperor or King to kiss. It is not by any means astonishing that the Irish priesthood—the Maynooth apostolic bachelors, who have been raised like logs of timber from the bogs and huts of Ireland, should strive for ascendancy—that they should raise a yearly tribute for you their ready and pliant tool, and usher you forward into a proclamation on your part of the same nonsense and blasphemy which to this hour fills their deluded imaginations. The very poor scholar, whose feelings, career, and unique character, are so admirably delineated by the graphic pen of Carleton—this beggar-general, on a minor and different scale from that which distinguishes you, became a God maker the day he was made a priest! The instant he was invested with St. Peter's keys, he rose not only above the Queen of this empire, but above the angels of heaven, St. Joseph and the Virgin Mary. Moses with his shining face and mysterious rod, was but a stripling in power compared with this modern lawgiver. Joshua the great commander of the people of God, was but the mere type or reflexion of this modern luminary in working miracles. "Sun stand thou still upon Gibeon, and thou moon upon Ajelon," said he in his prayer of faith, and

both at once stood still. *Hoc est corpus meum,* saith the hedge priest, without either prayer or faith and behold! "God obeys," and is actually created on the altar. How magnificient and dreadful is the power of such men! If Heaven itself depends on them, according to De Besse, so does the whole frame of nature. Let us tremble, lest on some occasion they may combine, make calculations of the longtitude like Hohenloe, and uniting their power in one simultaneous effort, turn in one instant the sun into a gas-lamp, the moon into a crown piece—the stars into guineas—the sky into an umbrella—the rivers into wine; and in opposition both to the distillers and the temperance society, convert the Pacific Ocean into brandy—the Atlantic into rum, and the Irish sea into whiskey; and above all let us dread, that when these gods become intoxicated, they may be tempted, like Sampson, to put their hands against the pillars of old dame nature, and bring down her dwelling-place, with a thundering crash on the ears of all the heretics in the world.

Their power, after all, Mr. O'Connell, is not very great; it is just akin to the philosophy of the inquisitor, who, in a speech condemnatory of Galileo's discoveries, after he invented the telescope, said, "the stars were nothing but lamps, which the angels hung out in the sky at night, and came and took them in in the morning"; or that of the old woman, who proved, by as good reasoning as you could employ in favour of transubstantiation, that the stars were only gimlet holes in the sky, for the angels to look through. In fact, Sir, Popery is the poetry of corruption—a mere creation of the imagination—an epic, in which men are exalted into gods—the gods appear in the form of men, and even of wafers; and through ignorance, superstition, early training, and associations; men cleaving to this imaginary system, spurn reality from the mind, and embrace fiction with all the ardour of a Stilite or eastern devotee. True, indeed! this amazing epic production occupied a long time in the composition—it came out into the world in parts, and passed through various editions, until it was finally revised and completed by the Council of Trent, with Dens for its annotator. But, after all, it has but one author, who has carefully preserved the unity of the action, and caused its successive heroes stanchly to oppose the circulation of the Scriptures without note or comment. When the present edition is out of print, it is generally believed that the subtle author will put nothing to the press again, till after the millenium; he, being imprisoned during a thousand years, like an Irish tithe martyr, will have sufficient time for study and improvement, and in all likelihood will try a new edition to deceive the nations of Gog and Magog once more. I am inclined to this opinion from the conviction, that he is much fonder of a false religion, as an instrumentality against the true one, than he is of open infidelity: and that during his thousand years of rumination, he will not be able to invent any system so specious, so pliant, and so well adapted to his purpose, as that which now exists; but will then be obsolete and forgotten. He may give the old blade a new handle, however, and a little temper in his forge; and he will find it as handy in the camp of the saints at that coming period, as it was in Paris on the eve of St. Bartholomew, or in this country in the year 1641.

Now, Mr. O'Connell, I appeal to you—to every priest in Ireland—to every man of a thinking mind in the community, is transubstantiation true?

Can any man in his sober sense believe it? Do you believe it now? Then answer my arguments. I *now* defy you to this point. I challenge any or all the bishops, priests, friars, jesuits in Ireland, to answer what I have advanced in these three letters. The whole of Popish ingenuity united cannot do it. You say you believe this dogma with "the certitude of faith." Shew your faith now by your works; and if you cannot do this, never have the presumption again, while you have a being, to invite any Protestant of any denomination to receive such an abominable and monstrous tenet. The fact is, that nineteen out of every twenty of the priests no more believe it than I do. A friend of mine was once in close conversation with an old school fellow, who was then a priest, "Tell me, priest," said he, "do you really believe in transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, prayers to saints," &c. "Whether do you ask me as a priest, or as a friend?" said his reverence.—"As a priest," said the other. "Well, then, as a priest I do believe in them, and I am sworn to believe in them." "May I ask you now as a friend, said the other?" "Well, then, to tell you the plain truth," said this pious, good priest, "the d—l a one word of them I believe at all, at all." This, Sir, as certainly occurred as your foot is still in Father O'Leary's trap. In the meantime, praying that you may yet have resolution to shake it off by an humble recantation of all your errors.

I am, your obedient servant,

Cork. Oct. 2, 1839. DANIEL M'AFEE.

TO DANIEL O'CONNELL, Esq., M. P.

Sir,—In the year 1537, the Pope appointed a Council at Vincentia for reforming the Church, of which, he was the head and patron. Luther wrote a book on this occasion, to which, he affixed a humorous and very significant frontispiece. His Holiness was pictured, as sitting on a high throne around which several Cardinals stood, each having a long pole, with the tail of a fox fastened to its end, pretending thereby to sweep away the filth of the Church. From this very picture we might easily infer the great knowledge and correct judgment of Luther respecting your Church, which according to Dr. Murray, is "unchangeable and unchanged." She was infallible then; she is so still; and hence, any attempt at a reformation, never can take place by her, professedly as a church; any effort of the kind would be but mere cunning and artifice—but sweeping her filthy corners with a fox's tail.

If Luther were existing now, he might indulge his humour, of which he was not destitute, in relation to you. As he would find you a stanch son of your grim, withered, haggard, time-worn and cunning old mother, whose hair has grown grey in error, and sin; so he might depict you, in a frontispiece published with your history, as old reynard himself, having two tails instead of one. He would no doubt, represent your *political* one, as trailing through the streets of London, and there shaking dust into the eyes of her Majesty's ministers, when assembled in parliament, or in the privy council. He would also give you a *theological* one, consisting of the bishops and priests of Ireland, which, he would curiously exhibit as sweeping the pence out of the pockets of the poor Irish, in order to replenish

your den at Derrynane. To represent your position at the Bandon dinner, in which you boasted that a protestant sat on your one hand, and a presbyterian on the other; he would delienate you as an old fox, artfully praising a pair of tame fowl, which you intended to pluck and feast on at a convenient season, when a repeal of the happy union between you and them should take place. And then, as it regards your presiding at the great dinner given in this city, to the popish bishops and priests assembled at the opening of the new Dominican chapel on Pope's quay, on which occasion, you whined and talked about the great persecutions, which you, your ancestors, and your church endured, he would represent the whole company, as a group of foxes, with the oldest and most artful at their head, as deeply lamenting the fate of their ancestors, because some of them got a broken leg or a few drops of swan shot, being caught in the act of plundering a farm yard; while St. Dominic himself, after whom the chapel is named, should appear in the back ground, as a hero of the Inquisition, booted and spured, with a sword by his side, and in the act of going forth at the head of a troop of fanatical persecuters, to slay the unoffending Albigenses.

Now, Mr. O'Connell, when you presided at the Cork dinner, did you not act the part of reynard in relation to my letters? Were you not afraid of another shot from my gun? Did you not artfully elude the matter as if you had never written one word against the Wesleyans, and as if I had never lifted my pen against your vile abuse and your false religion? You never had a more favourable opportunity of making a reply—you were in the City, where my letters were first published—you were within a few streets of where I reside—the occasion was one of religion—the charges I made required an answer—you have received injury both in your influence and your tribute, by not rebutting them. Why did you not do so? Simply, because you found my facts and arguments too hard even for your sophistry to mould into a ridiculous form. The public are perfectly aware of your disposition and tact, in seizing on anything, which might serve your cause. Your son Maurice afforded a striking instance of the same kind of talent, when he pounced upon my mistake, at the same time, he was perfectly aware of the truth of the case, which I developed at large in my letter to him. It is only a few days ago, since I came to the knowledge of the fact, that he himself was the bearer of the document from you to Shanahan, and handed it with your reply at the bottom, into the poor man's hand. I am sorry, I did not know this fact at the time I addressed him; for I should then have depicted the boldness of his hypocrisy, in attempting the challenge, which he gave me, at a greater length. But enough of introduction to this letter, and we must come at once to the main object, which I have in view. What is that? Why? to talk a little about the mass.

We have discussed transubstantiation already; it is proved to be false; you know it is, and cannot defend it; if so, the mass also must be false. How many kinds of masses are there? I really cannot exactly say. I know there are high masses and low masses, white masses and black masses, red masses and green masses, and I am not certain, but there may be purple and even *orange* masses—of course, if they be of every colour, the orange being one of the primary colours of nature, must come in for an honourable share, as well as the other colours, Having fully examined transubstantiation in the abstract, and demonstrated it, to be absurd, irra-

tional, unscriptural, and impossible, we proceed a step farther and view it in relation to the mass, which constitutes the primary act of your public worship, and which distinguishes the Church of Rome from all other churches in the world. If this be found wrong, then she is rotten at the very core, corrupt in her very essence, and from her assumed infallibility, incapable of reform, and must be forsaken altogether. All, who have deserted her pale, have cast off the mass as pernicious, abominable and idolatrous. Were they right or wrong in doing so? That we may understand this, and come to a proper conclusion, it is necessary to know, what the mass is, and whether it be in accordance with the will and word of God. In the mass, there are three leading things, which embrace all the minor particulars—the *sacrifice*, the *ceremonies*, and the *worship*,—

I.—As it regards the sacrifice of the mass, the substance of what is said concerning it is this—that the consecrated Host or wafer is Christ, really and truly—that Christ is thus presented as a sacrifice—that this sacrifice is an unbloody one, and that it is expiatory for the sins, both of the living and the dead. Hence, it is considered the centre of all spiritual exercises, the soul of a devout life, a sacrament superior to all others, the source of all grace, the end of all devotion, the highest offering which earth can present to heaven, and must be accompanied with the most excellent and sublime worship. It is unnecessary, here, to quote from the Council of Trent, or any other authority, as you are conscious, Mr. O'Connell, that I have given a fair statement. That we may not loose ourselves in a multitude of words, let us reduce it to this simple point—that the sacrifice offered in the mass, or presentation of the Host to God, is the *identical sacrifice* of *Christ*. This is the point simply to be considered; and that we may do so aright, let us here quote the 31st article of the Church of England as presenting my creed on this subject, by way of contrast. "The offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore, the sacrifices of Masses, in the which, it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." Here now, sir, we come to an issue at once. This article is simple, comprehensive, strong and scriptural. If it be true, the mass necessarily must be false. That it is true, and that the mass is a "blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit," I proceed now to prove in a very summary manner. This article gives a delightful view of the sacrifice of Christ; and that the sacrifice of the mass is not the sacrifice of Christ, will appear evident from the following particulars;—

1. Christ's *sacrifice* was *himself*. The High Priest among the Jews offered the bullock, the goat and the lamb; Christ offered himself. A few scriptures will prove this. "Thou shalt make *his soul* an *offering* for sin. Christ also hath *loved* us, and hath *given himself* for us, an offering and a sacrifice unto God of a *sweet smelling savour*. God—hath in these last days *spoken* unto us by his son, whom he hath appointed *heir* of all things, by *whom* also he made the worlds: who being the *brightness* of his glory, and the *express image* of his person, and *upholding* all things by the *word* of *his power*, when he *had* by *himself* purged our sins, *sat down* on the right hand of the majesty on high." Now, Mr. O'Connell, compare these declara-

tions with your sacrifice of the Mass. What is it? Why? the Host; but the Host, has been proved—amply proved, to be only a piece of parched paste. There it now is in the hand of the priest, and to it the people are in the act of bowing down. Pray, Sir, is *its soul* made an offering for sin? Has it a soul? If so; who gave it one? The priest breathed on it, to be sure, and he is its creator. Did the Host love us, and give itself for us? Has it a sweet smelling savour before God? Does it not smell of bread? Did it ever speak to us in these last days? If so, what did it say?—that Popery is an imposture, and the worship of the Host idolatry. Is it heir of all things? Then you should claim your tribute from it, and not from the poor Irish, as it possesses the fee-simple of all property. Why does this deity not take the tithes from those hereticks which pronounce it an idol, and give them to those priests, who first make, and then worship it? Why does it not turn the Lords and Bishops out of parliament, as they stand greatly in your way, and that of your church? Pray, Sir, did the Host create the world? Then it must have created itself and existed, before it began to be. Where was its wisdom in the formation of some things which it made? Why did it produce Luther, Cranmer, Calvin, and Henry the eighth? Why keep up a race of heretics in opposition to itself? Is it not rather an odd kind of God to have all power, and not help such an honest, pious, and decided devotee as yourself, a little more? You have some reason to suspect its attachment; or perhaps it suspects you; and considers you a vain, ambitious, blustering, and rather dubious kind of disciple, who is working more for your own selfish ends, than for the glory of the Host. Do you believe it is the brightness of God's glory? If so; why is it so dull, and even brown in the priest's hand? Can you assert that it is the *express* image of Jehovah's person? Then the Divine Being is composed of bread, his form is circular, and his diameter about an inch. Here is the legitimate tendency of this absurdity; it leads to atheism. Is not this sacrifice of the Mass, "a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit?"

2. The *sacrifice* of the *Mass*, is *not* the *sacrifice* of *Christ*, because the *priests* are *not* the *same*, who present it to God. Christ offered his own sacrifice; the priest presents that of the Mass. Now, if the wafer lived, and moved, and in the form of humanity, and with the essence of divinity, presented itself, there would be something, at least, plausible in the matter. This however is not the case. The priest offers the Host, as the sacrifice of Christ, and simply, because he does so, the very fact demonstrates the falsity of the offering. A few texts from Paul to the Hebrews prove this. "Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God.—Called of God, an high priest, after the order of Melchisedec.—But this man, because he continueth ever hath an unchangeable priesthood.—The word of the oath, which was since the law maketh the Son, (a priest) who is consecrated for evermore.—But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come—by his own blood, he entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." Now, Sir, it must either be acknowledged, that the Host, or the priest is our Lord Christ. If the Host be Christ; then *it offers itself*, and the priest of Rome is a false, intermeddling and impious

creature for interfering in the matter. He has no right to be called a priest. He is not one after the order of Aaron, for that priesthood is done away. He is not one after the order of Christ; because Christ can have no successor, seeing he ever lives in heaven, and exercises his own office. The Apostle expressly says, that Christ hath ἀπαράβατον an unchangeable priesthood; or one, that literally *passeth not from one to another*, because he holdeth it perpetually and dieth not. The priest of your church, in this ministration, being neither the successor of Aaron, nor of Christ, as a priest; it follows, that, he is no priest at all; and consequently, that so far as he is concerned, there is no sacrifice in the Mass, because there is no priest to present it. The Host therefore, is the only priest on this occasion. If so; then, it sprang from the tribe of Judah; it was born of the Virgin Mary! it suffered on the cross; it is after the order of Melchisedec; and hence, it is "without father (true!) and without mother (true!) without descent (true!) having neither beginning of days (is this true?) nor end of life;" very true! because it never had any; a full proof of which, we have, that even after consecration, it cannot offer itself. Is the Host a priest?—then, it cannot be Christ; for *he* is passed into the heavens, there to appear in the presence of God; but *it* abides on earth and returns unto the dust, whence it was taken, even after it has been either stolen or lost. The sacrifice of the mass has no priest; and hence, it is no sacrifice of any kind, much less the sacrifice of Christ. It is therefore, "a blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit."

3. The *sacrifice* of the *Mass, is not* the *sacrifice* of *Christ*, simply because his was a *living* and *voluntary one*. To the law and to the testimony again. "The *Son* of *Man* came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give *his life* a ransom for many.—The *good shepherd* giveth *his life* for the sheep.—In his humiliation his judgment was taken away: and who shall declare his generation; for *his life* is taken *from* the *earth*.—Hereby perceive we the *love* of *God*, because he laid down *his life* for us.—My father loveth me because I lay down *my life*, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but *I lay* it *down* of *myself*. I have *power* to lay it down and I have power to take it again." These scriptures express three things, first, that Christ possessed life; secondly, that he sacrificed it for us; and thirdly, that he did this of his own free will and eternal goodness. Now, Mr. O'Connell, let me ask you, Does the Host or wafer possess life? If so, when did it first begin to live? What evidence have you of its life? Did you ever see it move, or walk, or run, or rise, or stand? Did you ever see it breathe, or speak, or hear it make a speech, or do any one thing whatever? Whether is its life divine or human? To what species of animated life does it belong? Is its life limited or eternal? Christ the life, was the Son of God; is it so? Christ was the Son of Man, is it the son of man or the son of Mary? Christ, as the life, raised Lazarus, the Widow's son, and the daughter of Jairus from the dead; pray did the wafer do so? Was it the Host, which cried with a loud voice, "Lazarus come forth," and that said, "young man I say unto thee arise? If so; why has it not spoken in your church? Why did it not reprove you and the priests for holding political meetings on the Lord's day in the chapels, where its godship resided? Why did it not raise D'Astair from the dead whom you killed in a duel, out of pure regard for such a worthy worshipper

as yourself? Why does it not teach the priests, that it is the head of the church instead of the Pope? Why does it permit the people to pray to dead saints, when it is present itself as the living God? Why does it not excite the Bishops and priests to give the scriptures to the poor ignorant people, seeing it is Christ himself, who once said, "search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me?" It must be a very negligent Deity, when it permits image worship, swearing, sabbath breaking, faction fights, drunkenness, and perjury among you. You and your tail must, after all, have very little dread of it, or you would have been much more guarded respecting the solemn oath you took, not to interfere, with the protestant church.

Let us proceed a little farther. Did this deity lay down its life for you? How could it, when, it had none to lay down? If it died; how long is it since? Was it 1800 years ago? Or only on last sunday? At what hour did it die? Whether was it on the cross or on the altar? Was it previously led away to the High Priest? If so; what was his name? Dr. Crawley, or M'Hale? Did the Pope act the part of Peter in denying it, and you of Judas Iscariat in betraying it? He followed Christ for the bag, and you followed the Host for the tribute. As you were present on the occasion, pray what was the roman soldier's name, who pierced the side of the Host? The ceremonies of the mass, according to the shewing of your own church, are intended to figure forth the crucifixion; and does not this very fact classify your church with the wicked Jews and Romans, rather than with christians? The name of roman catholic is peculiarly appropriate, because you still continue to crucify your Saviour. If the Host laid down its life and died; at what time did it arise from the dead? How many angels rolled away the stone from the grave? Who first saw it after its resurrection? Did it say to the priests, "handle me and see for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me have?" Were you one of the 500 brethren, which saw it alive after its resurrection? Did it then ascend up into heaven? If so; how comes it to pass, that next sunday, it must come down and be crucified again? Ten thousand priests crucified it on sunday week, ten thousand Hosts arose from the dead and ascended into heaven, and ten thousand priests crucified it afresh last sunday, and yet they neither brought it down, nor sent it up, nor crucified it, nor was there more than one Host all the time, and that one is the very same Saviour, who died on the cross 1800 years ago, arose from the dead and *sat down* for *ever* on the *right hand* of *God!!!* Are you not conscious of the absurdity and falsehood of the mass, Mr. O'Connell? Undoubtedly you are, and hence, it need not be deemed strange that no one can trust your professions in friendship, when you are false in those, which you make to your wheaten deity.

Again, let me ask, Is the offering *voluntary* on the part of the Host? Has it power to lay down its life and power to take it again? The free will of the Host—the volitions of the Host—the resolutions and determinations of the Host, and of course, the understanding, memory, imagination conscience, and passions of a piece of bread, are rather extraordinary expressions! And yet after the words of consecration, if the Host be real Christ, their application is by no means improper. The Host then must offer itself voluntary, as a propitiary sacrifice for the sins of the quick and

dead. If it has no volition, there can be no sacrifice; because it is not the sacrifice of Christ; but a mere cheat and impious imposition. Who but a fool will attribute volition to a round piece of cake without life or animation? A man might as readily argue, that a stone can think, and reason, and resolve. The popish mass would establish the doctrine, that matter can think; and hence, destroy the immateriality of the soul. It whirls us at once into materialism and the atheistic, atomic philosophy of Democritus. The gods of the heathen were vastly superior to this God of the papacy. "They have mouths; but they speak not;"—this has no mouth. "They have eyes; but they see not"—this has no eyes. "They have ears; but they hear not"—this has no ears. "Noses have they; but they smell not"—this has no nose. "They have hands; but they handle not?'—this has no hands. "Feet have they; but they walk not"—this has no feet. Here then, Mr. O'Connell is a thing which is both priest and sacrifice in your church; and yet it has neither mouth, nor eyes, nor ears, nor nose, nor hands, nor feet; not can it speak, or see, or hear, or smell, or handle, or walk; it is neither human, nor can it do one human act; and yet, your church teaches, that it is the identical Saviour of the world, and that as a sacrifice for the quick and dead, it must present itself voluntarily to God! You will now agree with me in coming to the former conclusion, that, "the sacrifices of masses—are blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

4. The *sacrifice* of *Christ* was a *bloody one*, and made a *complete atonement*, "*propitiation*, and *satisfaction* for *all* the *sins* of the *whole world both original* and *actual*, and there is *none other satisfaction* for *sin*, but *that alone*;" and hence, the sacrifice of the mass cannot possibly be the sacrifice of Christ. We must now recur again to the Scriptures of truth." This is *my blood* of the New Testament, which is *shed* for *many*, for the *remission* of *sins*.—In whom, we have *redemption* through *his blood*, the forgiveness of sins.—Having *made peace* through the *blood* of *his cross*, by him to *reconcile all things* unto *himself*.—But now in Christ Jesus, ye who sometimes were far off, are *made nigh* by the *blood* of Christ.—For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; How *much more* shall the *blood* of *Christ*, who through the *eternal spirit offered himself* without spot to God, *purge* your *consciences* from *dead works* to serve the *living God*.—Unto him that loved us, and washed us from *our sins* in his *own blood*, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. These are they which came out of great tribulation, and *have washed* their *robes*, and *made* them *white* in the *blood* of the Lamb." Such is the current testimony of the word of God. Moses tells us Leviticus xxii. 11. "It is the *blood* that *maketh* an *atonement*," while St. John in his first Epistle, chap. i. 7, says, "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin;" and St. Paul, Heb. ix. 22, expressly declares, that, "without shedding of blood, is no remission." Now, Mr. O'Connell, let us keep to the main point—that the sacrifice of the mass is the sacrifice of Christ. This is the very marrow of the controversy. That it is not Christ's sacrifice is admitted, at once by the Council of Trent, and that in the very decree on this point." And seeing that in this divine sacrifice, which is performed in the Mass, he, the *same* Christ, is contained

and *unbloodily* immolated, who *bloodily* offered himself once on the altar of the cross." Such is the acknowledgment of this infatuated, stupid, infallible Council! They say, that the sacrifices are the *same*, and that they are *not* the *same*, for three reasons. First, *Christ* offered the *one*, and the *priest* offers the *other*; Second, Christ offered his *once* on the cross; the sacrifice of the Mass is offered *often* on altars; Third, Christ's was *one* of *blood*; the sacrifice of the Mass is *unbloody*. Here, the matter is totally given up, infallibility is confounded, and confusion spreads her wings over the wise men of Trent. The very fact of the sacrifice of the Mass being an *unbloody* one, takes away all virtue from it, and shews, that instead of procuring the same benefits, as those purchased by the blood of Christ, it is a mere figment of absurdity, that leaves the poor deluded votaries of the Church of Rome, without benefit of any kind. It has no virtue in itself, and hinders them from looking to Christ, in whom alone it is to be found. Glance at the benefits resulting from the blood of Christ, in the scriptures now enumerated. 1. His blood was shed *for* the *remission* of *sin*; how can the Host procure this, when it shed no blood because it had none, and if it had, it could not be the same blood of Christ, which was shed on the cross 1800 years ago? 2. The primitive christians had redemption through Christ's blood, the forgiveness of sins, pray, sir, was that the blood of a wafer, the substance of which grew in a field at Derrynane last year, and has by the concession of the Trent Council, shed no blood, because it had none? 3. By his own blood, he *reconciled all things* unto *himself*, and brought the Gentiles *nigh*, who were afar off; the wafer has reconciled nothing, nor did it ever bring one soul to God. It has been the cause of disturbance, of blood shed, though it had none of its own, and thousands have fallen into perdition, by trusting to it, instead of Jesus Christ. How many martyrs have been sent to the stake, because they would not confess it to be the Son of God? 4. The blood of Christ possessed, and still possesses the virtue of *purging* the *conscience* from *dead works*, to *serve* the *living God*; the blood, or virtue of the Host, has never purged any one. How could it, when it has none? Pray, Sir, has it purged you for instance? Has it taken away your guilt? the guilt of agitating, of disturbing your country, of running the ignorant and deluded peasantry into scenes of midnight depredation, by your false speeches? Has it removed from you, the guilt of early propensities, by which others were drawn aside from the path of virtue? Has it obliterated the guilt of reckless assertions, defamation of character, foul-mouthed lying, and the solemn oath taken by you, not to interfere with the Protestant institutions of the land? Do you believe, that the blood of this bloodless sacrifice, made an atonement for the sins of the scandalous popes enumerated in my third letter, or for those holy fathers of the inquisition, who lived in licentiousness, and died with hearts more cruel, than the grave? How can it atone for the iniquity of those priests, who, in the confessional, guided by Den's Theology, or Father Maherly's Good Confessor—(another infamous book among the priesthood,) have corrupted female virtue, by their iniquitous, chatechetical mode of proceeding? The fact is this; the sacrifice of the Mass is a mere imposture; and giving it all the reality, which the imagination, even of a sincere devotee attributes to it; it renders null by its very perfection, priestly absolution, penances, extreme unction, and purgatory; for

when the Host is a complete propitiation for the sins, both of the quick and dead, there is no necessity for the other nostrums of your church, unless to increase the income of her clergy, as all her varied articles must be purchased with money. The mass is her standing and staple article in trade, and surely she, who is capable of selling, what she has decreed to be the Saviour of the world for filthy lucre, even for the recovery of a sick animal, is capable of driving a hard bargain in relation to any other fictitious commodity, that may be popular in her religious mart. It is evident, however, that the English reformers were right in saying, that the "sacrifice of the Mass—is a blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit."

5. The *sacrifice* of *Christ* was *offered only once* for *all mankind*, and that upon the *cross;* and hence, the sacrifice of the Mass is not, nor can it possibly be the sacrifice of Christ. The Apostle proves this, in the following declarations:—He saith of Christ, "Who needeth *not daily*, as those high priests, to *offer* up *sacrifice*, first for his *own sins*, and then for the *peoples;* for this he did *once*, when he *offered up himself*. Nor yet, that he should offer *himself often*, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year, with blood of others. For then must he *often* have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now *once* in the end of the world, hath he *appeared* to put away sin, by the *sacrifice* of *himself*.—By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the *body* of Jesus Christ, *once* for all.—But this man after he had *offered one sacrifice* for *sins* for *ever*, *sat down* on the *right hand* of *God*." So St. Paul in his epistle to the Hebrews. Let us now hear St. Peter, and we shall soon see, whether his successors, so called, are following his faith. "For Christ also hath *once suffered* for *sins*, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God."

Now, Sir, there are three reasons, why Christ only required to suffer *once*. 1. The *dignity* of his person; he was God, and man, united in one person. "The word was made flesh" to this very end, that he might present only one offering for sin. 2. The *infinite*, intrinsic virtue or merit of his blood, arising from this dignity: and 3. The *requisition* of infinite justice. It required a sufficient equivalent for the sins of mankind; it received all it demanded from the one offering of Christ upon the cross; and hence, our Lord cried, "it is finished"—the atonement is completed—justice is satisfied, and then, he gave up the ghost. Let us now compare your mass sacrifice, with this, Mr. O'Connell. Take it now for granted, that Christ is sacrificed in the mass—that it is his identical sacrifice which is offered.—Then it follows: 1. That, he is not God; for, if he were, his sacrifice would require no repetition. It is offered often in the mass, and this stamps the imperfection of the offering. On this principle, the Apostle, in writing to the Hebrews, reasons against the intrinsic value of Jewish sacrifices, because they were often made. 2. It follows also, that the merit of his blood, was neither infinite nor sufficient to atone by one offering, and consequently, in point of merit, it was no better than the blood of bulls and goats. 3, It is evident, from the frequent repetition of Christ's sacrifice in the mass, that justice was not satisfied with our Lord's one offering on the cross, or else, it would require no repetition. 4. It incontestibly follows, from all this—that our Lord uttered a falsehood, when, he said on the cross, "it is finished"; and that both Peter and Paul have equally imposed on mankind, in contending for the completion

of the atonement by his once dying—once sacrificing himself on the accursed tree. What now is the sacrifice of the Mass? It is the *unbloody sacrifice* instituted first by Numa Pompilius, made of pure, fresh flour, and is a remnant of his heathenism, instead of being the offering of Jesus Christ. It agrees much better with Cain's sacrifice, which the Lord rejected, being only of the fruit of the earth, than with Abel's, which Jehovah accepted, because it was a bloody one. It is an open, standing, repeated, multifarious, sanctioned, and perpetual lie, libel, and mockery of the person, sacrifice, and atonement of Jesus Christ. It denies his divinity, and the merit of his blood. It tarnishes, and misrepresents the justice of the eternal Being, as the governor of the world. It gives the lie, *de facto*, to the Apostles; and hence, to the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. It is a practical overturning of the very foundation of christianity—the finished atonement of the cross. It is the battering ram of the church of Rome, raised up against the fundamental principles of christianity, and the simplicity of salvation by faith, and the redemption of the world. It is the priest's finger post, which shews the road to Rome, but not the way to Heaven; in a word, it denies that Christ sat down for ever, on the right hand of God, after finishing his atoning work; and hence, denies the existence of that heaven to which he is gone.

Where Christ is personally present, there is his local heaven, sir, but he is present in every popish chapel, and therefore, his heaven is found in those localities. In a small pix, or chest, made of wood, silver, or some other metal, he is kept under, or near the altar; and is thus preserved from mice, rats, and all kinds of vermin. How long, this peculiar deity, could remain fresh without being blue-moulded, can only be decided by the popish doctors. At all events, the chapel is his heaven—his new Jerusalem. See! there is one, say, in the county of Tipperary, at the foot of a lonely mountain, skirted by a deep glen. Who are those individuals, that in groups, of three or four, are descending the hill side, or traversing the windings of the glen? Why they are ribbonmen to be sure, who are repairing to the chapel as a rendevouz, from whence, they issue to murder, burn, or rob; they are angels of light, guided by a torch, which is to burn up the haggard, barn, or cow-house of some unoffending neighbour, who refuses to be initiated into their mysteries. Take another of these local heavens, Townsend street Chapel, for instance, in the City of Dublin. No doubt, the wheaten Host dwells there in all sanctity and glory. But how often, have you and others polluted the temple of the god in his very presence, by political meetings and speeches, even on the Lord's day? If such be the heaven of the papacy, what are its hell and purgatory?

Come now, Mr. O'Connell, lay aside your prejudice for a little, and consider the vast difference between your church and the protestant one, now established by law in these countries. You and the priests are labouring assiduously, and even openly to throw down the one, and re-establish the other. Your feeling is, that, because your party is more numerous in Ireland, than the protestant community, therefore, your religion should be supported by the state. True it is, you disclaim ascendency! But who can believe you? I for one do not; no; not one word you utter either on this or many other points. To judge rightly of this matter, only consider seriously the essential difference between your Church, and the united

Church of England and Ireland. Observe, we are not to be guided by the views of insulated parties, whether Puseyites on the one hand, or Antinomians on the other, who may broach doctrines subversive of the elementary principles of the Church. We must abide by the articles, as founded on the word of God. Keep to the one now in question, which is decidedly a fundamental one. Compare it with your Trent creed, and your sacrifice of the mass. The comparison will result in this, that the state supports truth in the one case; in the other, the most notorious falsehood, would be sanctioned and nourished. The following particulars will exhibit the contrast:—

1. The sacrifice of Christ, exhibited in the 31st article of the Church established, is scriptural; your sacrifice of the Mass is unscriptural. 2. The sacrifice of this article was appointed of God; your sacrifice of the mass never was; it is the invention of men; and the very focus, of what the Apostle terms, "the mystery of iniquity." 3. The sacrifice acknowledged by the reformers, was accepted of God, for the remission of sins; your sacrifice of the mass can procure no remission. 4. The Protestant sacrifice was *once offered only*, and that upon the *cross*; your sacrifice of the mass, never hung upon the cross, never shed its blood there, never died for the world; and from its *repeated offerings* demonstrates itself to be an imposture. 5. The great sacrifice, which forms the very basis of the Protestant religion, was presented to God under peculiar circumstances; the rocks rent, the graves opened, the vail of the temple was torn asunder, and darkness covered the heavens for the space of three hours; your sacrifice of the mass is destitute of the very semblance of these things, unless we can believe, that the incense of high mass, is the identical darkness recorded in the scriptures. 6. The sacrifice to which we are directed in the 31st article, was raised from the dead, and afterwards "shewed himself alive by many infallible proofs"; your sacrifice of the mass—that piece of parched bread, never had any resurrection, except what it had in a wheaten field, where it grew in spring, in common with other grain. 7. The sacrifice of the Reformed church *ascended up* into *heaven, sat down* for *ever* on the *right hand*, of *God*, and *remains* in a *state* of *incorruptibility*; the sacrifice of the mass, in your church, is of the earth, earthy, and returns to the dust again, whence, it was taken. Pray, Sir, do you think, St. John, in Revelations xiii., had any allusion to this, when he spoke of the second beast, which, he beheld arising out of the earth? You know the wheaten god grows out of the earth, carries the Romish hierarchy along with it, as its horns; and through them speaks with a dragon mouth, and deceives those, who dwell on the earth. This, however, is only a mere query, which you may legally investigate at your leisure; while, in the meantime, we must come to a conclusion, respecting the practical efforts now carried on by you and the priests. In your address to the people of England, you would piously invite them back to the mass; for the world may say, what they please of you, Mr. O'Connell, you are a *very pious, honest, upright* man of *truth!* and you would have the present Church, established in these countries, overturned, and your own set up in its place; and you would give the tithes to the priests; and for the good of our souls, you would soon try and force us all to mass; and as old Bernard Clinton, a priest's brother, who became a genuine protestant, used to say of the mass, "taste it not

my friends, for there's gravel in it"; so if any of us refused to eat gravel, you would quietly continue to make the executive power force it down our throats, as a second course, after "Lord John Russell's purge."

Now, Mr. O'Connell, I should wish to know, what *right*, the state possesses, to cast off the present Church establishment, and substitute yours, in its stead—that is, simply to renounce the sacrifice of Christ, which is the central point of the true religion, and establish and support the sacrifice of the mass, which is the focus of the false religion. *Right* implies a *just claim* on the one hand, implying a *corresponding obligation* on the other. It must therefore take its rise from *some cause*, or *relationship*, subsisting in your Church, that would evidently justify the present, or any other government, in bestowing on her the property of the empire for her support. All right must immediately, or remotely come from the Divine Being, and be conveyed by creation, providence, or revelation, as recorded in his word. Let us calmly, then, examine her claims to state patronage, or in fact to support of any kind, or character whatever. They must arise from some source, and the question to be solved is, what that source really is?

1. Does it consist in *numerical existence?* Surely not. Ireland contains eight million of inhabitants. Three-fourths of these are romanists, beclouded under a dark, superstitious and false system of religion. The claim cannot consist in mere number. The greater the number, the more diffused is the error. A man has a *natural* right to life and liberty—to the enjoyment of light, air, and the various elements, and to the produce of his own personal labour. Every romanist in the land, has a right to these things. God has given that right, by the very fact of communicating existence. Between six and seven millions of these exist in Ireland—born and trained up in a religion directly repugnant to the revealed will of God; as they have a right to the blessings now enumerated, does it follow, that because they happen to be the more numerous party, their religion, as well as themselves, have a claim or right to be supported by the good things, which God has created? "The *earth* is the *Lord's* and the *fulness* thereof." Pray, Mr. O'Connell, with all your perversity of heart and intellect, can you believe for a moment, that God created the world, or one country in it, or one corner of a field in it, for the purpose of growing wheat, or oats, or barley, or hay, or food of any kind to support the priests of a false religion? Does God give a farm, or trade, or merchandize to any man, accompanied by health and ingenuity to operate, for the purpose of supporting a religion, which corrupts his revelation by traditions, denies the sacrifice of his Son by its masses, and runs the people into idolatry, by its prayers to saints and the worship of the Host? Undoubtedly not. Did he make any portion of the earth to nourish and support Paganism, Mahomedanism and Judaism, as it is at present? There are 600 millions of pagans in the world. Does their number give a right to the existence, much less, the establishment of their religion? A false religion, has no right to exist in the world. No man has any right to support it. It arises from the usurpation of the Devil. It may force its way by the might, not the right of its votaries. The design of christianity, was to destroy this usurpation; and hence, that government, which would grant your church state provision, is acting in opposition to God, and giving a sore discou-

ragement to the christian institutions of the land. The Divine Being can confer no right, in any possible manner, to uphold falsehood; He must first cease to be the God of truth. This would be conferring a right to propagate sin, which cannot possibly be done by the God of holiness.

2. Does the *antiquity* of your church, Sir, constitute her claim, so as to afford a justification of those, who would reestablish her in these lands? Paganism has a prior claim: for it existed from the building of the tower of Babel. Judaism has a prior claim; for it existed from the giving of the law. Druidism has a prior claim; for it was the established system in these countries before the introduction of popery. Mahomedanism has an equal claim; for it arose, at the same time in which Boniface III. proclaimed himself universal Bishop. The false prophet and the beast were contemporaries in their rise and career, and are according to the book of Revelation to be, mutually destroyed together. Antiquity proves nothing for you, it only makes the matter worse; for the longer any individual, or church, goes on in a course of error and sin, the greater should be our abhorrence of such perpetuated iniquity. Your church, Sir, has no claim from her age to any other thing, but to a heavier and more acute punishment.

3. Does her claim to state patronage arise from *former occupancy*? Surely not. The Jewish priests were once entitled to the tithes of Canaan; but does their right exist now? They crucified the Lord of glory, rejected his gospel, persecuted his Apostles and first followers, and by their unbelief and wicked conduct forfeited every previous claim to Divine favour. Your church, Mr. O'Connell, did the very same. She departed from the true faith, set up her own commandments in opposition to those of Christ, forbade to marry, commanded to abstain from meats, introduced purgatory, prayers for the dead, service in an unknown tongue, and the sacrifice of the mass, by which she nullifies the sacrifice of Christ. In addition to this, she kept the scriptures back from the people, persecuted and destroyed those who translated or read them; and at the time of the reformation, was ingulphed in every species of inward and outward iniquity. Is it because of her apostacy and sin, she should again be brought into favour? She was cut off as a prodigal; and where is her repentance and reformation, to entitle her again to a gracious reception? God by his providence turned out the harlot and usurper, stripped her of her trumpery, ornaments and wealth in these lands; and now having recruited her strength, laid her schemes, increased in revenue, and decorated herself in something of her old trappings, is she to be received again into court favour, and the true bride cast aside to make way for her scarlet ladyship? Let her only be admitted to a seat at the domestic table,—to a place in the household—to a small portion of the income, as if for pin money; and like every lady of her class, she will scheme and plot, and act the part of Jezebel, until she is either again cast out, or governs the household as her own. This is her nature, "unchangeable and unchanged;" and he who would bring her back by any means, acts in direct opposition to that God, who cast her on the world in the face of all the nations. Surely, she has no right to the dwelling, who for ages refused to pay the daily and annual tribute of true worship and conduct, which God, the great proprietor demanded at her hand. Being turned out for non payment of her legal and

evangelical debts to Christ; she is too much in arrear to discharge the mighty account; and hence, can never be tenant again, with his approbation.

4. Does her *right* arise from the *Apostolic succession* of her popes and bishops? If so; where does it exist? Be pleased, Sir, to trace it. Do not forget the iron links of this chain—the wicked popes enumerated in my third letter. Was pope Joan, the English woman, one of those links? From which of the three popes, who reigned and ordained Bishops at one and the same time, shall we suspend this apostolic chain? Where shall we hang it, during the interregnum, when for better than 70 years there was no pope? On which of the bishops? Name him. Your church, Sir, is the most unfortunate pretender, in the wide world, for the providence of God so ordered it, that even by popish hands, the history of villanous popes, is so well known, that all pretence to be the followers of Christ and his Apostles, is truly ridiculous. In fact, from the year, 606, in which Boniface III. proclaimed himself, according to pope Gregory the Great, to be Antichrist, the church of Rome lost her succession, and to this day has never found it. Does the succession of the popes constitute antichrist and the man of sin? Then, how can antichrist have his succession from Christ? He is directly his opposite. He opposes his will, his word and his kingdom. In the name then of common sense, how can he have his succession from Christ and his Apostles? Did antichrist steal it, or take it away by robbery or main force? It is only an assumption—a mere pretence. From which of the Apostles did it come? It must be the legacy of Judas Iscariot, the apostate, for it never was left to them by St. Peter, Paul, or any of the *faithful* Apostles of our Lord. Only that you might dispute the pedigree, in behalf of yourself and family, I would say, they are successors of Simon Magus. Wherever there is a *true succession* of *any thing*, there must be the *same causes* to *produce* it, the *same qualities* to *characterise* it, and the *same effects following* it. Thus, the rays of light flowing from a luminous body, the waves of the sea, and the reproduction of planets and animals, have the same invariable succession. Take away either cause, or qualities, or effects, and succession is lost. Examine these three things for a moment in connection with the church of Rome:—1. The *cause* of apostolic succession. What is it? The *call* and *ordination* of Christ. Christ is *wise;* and therefore he could never call a *fool*. Christ is *good;* and hence, he could never ordain a *bad* man. Christ is *holy*; and consequently, he could never send an *impious*, or *unholy* priest to convert the world. Christ is *just* and *righteous;* and it follows, that he could never give his sanction to a *thief* and a *robber* to enter, especially as a shepherd, into his fold. Christ is *sincere;* and it is impossible, he could appoint a *hypocrite*,—a *wolf* in *sheep's clothing* to be one of his special ministers, much less his vicar and vicegerent on earth. Christ is *benevolent* and *kind;* and hence he never sanctioned the *cruel* and monstrous popes of which we read, nor the persecuting Bishops, Bonner and Gardiner, for instance, who burned and destroyed so many unoffending and pious protestants. Christ is *truth* itself; and it is absolutely impossible, therefore, that he ever could either call, or ordain any man, in any age of the world, to *teach*, *foster*, and *support falsehood*. Hence any man, who teaches the creed of Pope Pius IV. never was called, or ordained of Christ; but the whole popish

hierarchy do so throughout the world; and therefore being destitute of Christ's call and ordination, they can have no Apostolic succession. The *cause* of true Apostolic succession, which is Christ—the head of his church has no connection with the church of Rome, seeing she departed from him; and where there is no cause there can be no effect. 2. Examine, again, the *qualities*, or *characteristics* of Apostolical succession; and you will find, Sir, that your church is destitute of these. A true successor of the Apostles, *must possess their spirit*—the spirit of Christ, *experience* the *same converting grace*, *live* the *same kind* of *holy life*, *follow* the *same example*, *do* the *same work*, and *preach* the *very same doctrines*, especially, he must preach *justification* by *faith* in the *blood* of *Jesus Christ alone*. Now, Sir, do the popes, bishops and priests of Rome possess these characteristics? To confine ourselves to one point; do they teach justification by faith alone? They do not; they cannot; the Council of Trent has put that beyond their reach. The man among them that does it, stands forth a protestant at once. Where, then, is their Apostolic succession, when, they have not one single quality, or mark of it? Pray, Sir, could a man be your successor as Queen's Counsel, that does not know as much law, as a Kerry peasant? Could a dumb man be your successor, as agitator general? Could a man of truth, be your successor in advancing the most barefaced, public and monstrous falsehoods, that ever disgraced any public character, since politics first became a trade? To assert, that the priests of Rome, are the successors of the Apostles, is the same kind of solecism, as if a barber, on removing into the house previously occupied by a hardware merchant, or a tailor into that of a gun smith, announced by a flaming sign board, that the one was successor to the other. True! he is successor in the occupation of the premises, but nothing more; and so error, in the Church of Rome, succeeded the truth of primitive christianity, seized upon its property, occupied its place, called itself by its name, usurped its authority, abused its patronage, marred its work, impeded its prosperity, trampled upon its claims, and crushed its followers. Here is your succession; a succession of darkness following light—of ignorance and wickedness coming after knowledge and holiness. 3. What are the *effects* of Apostolic succession? The conversion of sinners to God, the spread of true religion, and a diffusion of the Word of God, the overthrow of idolatry, the exercise of the right of private judgment, free enquiry, rational investigation, and the establishment of Christ's kingdom, by a progressive destruction of false religion, and yours of course among the rest. Here are the effects of true Apostolical succession. These followed the preaching of Wickliffe, Luther, and the English Reformers. These attended the ministry of Wesley and Whitfield, and their followers; and they are resulting from the united ministrations of the various protestant sections of the Church of Christ, who hold him to be the head, as, "God over all blessed for ever." When, were these effects produced in your Church? Not, since she became apostate from the faith. Talk then about Apostolic succession! You braved the Wesleyans to this point. What have you now gained by it? Antichrist can have no succession from Christ. That is as plain as any mathematical axiom. To support your Church, therefore, is to support Antichrist. The protestant statesman, so called, who does so, must be an infidel in disguise. The man, who

gives her voluntary support, is blind, and abuses the property of God; but he, who would give her public patronage and support, is guilty of a national sin, sets a bad example to the world, betrays the cause of protestantism, robs Christ of his property, gives it to his enemies, countenances all the former iniquity of the Church of Rome, prevents the extension of Christ's kingdom on earth, and becomes a public enemy to the conversion of the world. Not so, in relation to the Established Church. She is pure in her fundamental principles, scriptural in her articles or creed, simply sublime in her worship, and catholic in her spirit. While she adheres to the one article, now specially noticed; the "blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit" of the mass, cannot overturn her. God will not permit it. In a mere, moral contention, she must prevail; and should you, Sir, to gratify your ambition and exalt your religion, drive your followers into rebellion, under pretence of loyalty to the throne, Babylon, with all her pride and violence, shall fall by a strong hand; and in these countries, never more be found at all, either, in a civil, or religious state of being. So much now, for the sacrifice of the mass, and the various associations, which accompany it.

II. Now, Sir, before we part, at present, permit me to have a few rather pleasing words with you, about the *ceremonies* and *accompaniments* of the *mass*, and a few very solemn ones, about *its worship*. To commence with the *dress* of a pope, bishop, or priest, is it not to say the least, a little fantastical? Your Church explains it thus. The *Amice*, or linen veil, which he first puts on, represents the covering put on Christ's face in the house of Caiaphas—the *Albe*, signifies the garment put upon him by Herod—the *Girdle*, the cord that bound him in the garden—the *Maniple*, the one which bound him to the pillar—the Stole, the one whereby, he was led to be crucified—the priest's upper *Vestment*, indicates the seamless coat, and the purple robe put on him by Pilate. The mass, according to this, is a curious, tragical, and pious, theatrical representation of the crucifixion, in which, the Priest is the chief actor. He is dressed like Christ, and he acts like him. Hence, his coming back three steps from the altar, and humbling himself before he begins, is intended to signify the prostration of Christ in the garden. Alas! however, there is confusion, and a want of unity in the action of the drama. For, if the wafer be Christ himself, he can require no representation, as he is truly present. The very actings of the priest, therefore, contradict the real presence, and as the one is a mere sham or shew, so is the other. It unfortunately happens, in relation to this unfortunate Church of yours, Mr. O'Connell, that the Heathen Priests, from the time of Numa Pompilius, dressed and acted in the same manner. This is proved at large, in Meagher's book on the Popish Mass. Besides, we have no account in the New Testament, of the Apostles and primitive preachers, either saying mass, or dressing in such a ludicrous style. Let, me now ask, why do you use *lamps* or *candles*? Mass must be celebrated in the forenoon. Surely the sun is then up; and there is no necessity for those tapers. The Priest and the people don't require them, for, they have day light. The wafer god, does not need them; for, it has no eyes. The God of Heaven sees, as well without them, as with them. The ancient Persians worshipped fire, do you wish to keep up a remnant of their religion, in conjunction with many others? Pray, Sir, can you explain, the

origin and benefit of *holy water?* It is said, to be very good for keeping away the fairies, driving off that incubus—the night mare, preventing blights, curing diseases, killing rats, mice and weasels. Many a sprinkling you got of it. Has it driven the evil spirit out of you? The Heathens considered this *aqua lustralis*, as an expiation of their sins, especially *lies* and *perjury*. You should always carry a bottle of it along with you. No man requires it more. I can never forget your lie about John Wesley and the Protestant Association; it was not worse, however, than your assertion, that 100 Irish constables kept the peace in Newport, during the insurrection of the Chartists. Not one Irishman was among the Constables. What a pity you did not get a little sprinkling of holy water, immediately after inventing that fiction, for it might have saved you the necessity and expense of an additional confession. Why do your priests use *incense?* Do they wish to pass for Jewish, as well as, Christian priests? To whom is it offered? Not to the people; they may see it smoke and smell it, but that is all. Not to the God of heaven; for he neither commands, nor accepts of it under the present dispensation. It must then be presented to the Host; but why do so, when this *deity* has *no nose?* Again, Why is the mass celebrated in an *unknown tongue*? Do the people understand Latin? If not; what benefit do they derive? It is a mere pantomime, unscriptural and absurd. What is it better than the Irvingite's fanaticism, venting itself in unknown tongues? The poor Irish say, the mass is celebrated in this manner, "because the Devil does not understand Latin." Father M'Guire himself, could not advance a better reason. We may infer, however, that the wafer after consecration understands it; and hence, it must be very quick in its apprehension; and for a thing, without understanding, memory, or one of the five senses to become an adept in learning, and a god in divinity, in such a short period, is truly marvellous indeed! Your religion, Mr. O'Connell, is very like yourself, an odd kind of medley.

Now, in conclusion, Sir, is the worship of the Host idolatrous or not? It stands now stripped of every attribute of divinity, and in reason's eye, it is but bread, and nothing more. Even to imagine it to be Christ, is sinful; and to worship it is worse. Reflect on these words—"Thou shalt not make unto thyself any graven image, or the likeness of anything in heaven above: or in the earth beneath. Thou shalt not bow down to it nor worship it." This is the word of God; and the mass is a violation of it.

I am, &c.,

Cork, January 11, 1840. DANIEL M'AFEE.

BABYLON FALLEN.*

DEDICATED TO DANIEL O'CONNELL, Esq. M. P.

Fallen is mighty Babylon!
Her titles and estates are gone.
Her temples, palaces, and towers,
Stern desolation now devours.
Her chariots, horses, men of power
Shall tread her battle fields no more.
Like Sodom, in one hour her name
Was blotted from the list of fame.

Lo! on a Beast of Blasphemy
She stately sat, a Queen was she!
Intoxicated with the blood
Of the most precious Saints of God.
In purple and in scarlet robe
She seemed as mistress of the globe,
Adorned with pearls and precious stones,
And trinkets made of Martyrs' bones.

Upon her forehead, stamped with blood,
Her magic name conspicuous stood,
"Mother of Harlots"—gay and grave—
Of all whom Popish vows enslave—
Of every foul "Abomination"
In every age and every nation—
Since Boniface the Third was known
To sit upon the Papal throne.

Emblem of her alluring arts,
Bewitching unenlightened hearts,
A chalice framed of purest gold,
Filled with the filtres which she sold,
She held, and bade the nations drink,
While millions not inured to think
Quaffed of the mixture, and became
Defenders of her sin and shame.

She, in a gloomy, leaden hour,
Trampled on kings, and mocked their power.
Some held her stirrup as she rose,
While others basely kissed her toes;
And as for Britain's far-fam'd crown
She hurled it from the head of John,
Till trembling on his bended knees,
He swore her Ladyship to please.

* See Revelation, chaps. xvii. and xviii., Isaiah. xiii. Jeremiah. l. and li.

Meanwhile her vile, inventive mind,
Devised communion in one kind,
And taught her priests the magic trade
Of making HIM, who all things made;
For o'er a piece of parched paste,
Enrob'd she stood, and cried "*Hoc est*
"*Corpus meum*—behold 'tis he!
"Soul, body, blood, divinity."

This great enchantress, in her pride,
Proclaim'd herself the Saviour's bride,
Seiz'd PETER's chair, and stole his keys,
And sat *infallibly* at ease,
Cursing all men on earth who dwell
Down to the lowest shades of hell
Who dare to doubt or thwart her word,
However wicked or absurd.

To shew that she alone was wise,
She bade her votaries close their eyes;
And moved them by her magic call,
Like puppets strung around a wall.
She made them worship wood and stone,
And pray to ghosts and saints unknown,
And caused their blinded hearts to dread
False apparitions of the dead.

With juggling, necromantic art,
On earth's wide stage she played her part.
Processions—holy raree-shows,
Up at her secret touch arose,
While painted, purgatorial fires
Blazed round the late departed sires,
And led their trembling sons to pay
For Masses till the judgment day.

Parent of carnal institutions,
Confessionals and absolutions,
A vast insurance office she
Established for iniquity.
Enclosed she sat, and waved her keys,
While bankrupt sinners at her knees
Unrolled their lengthening list of sin,
And paid the usual premium in.

At length, in madness, guilt and pride,
Casting all past restraint aside,
Indulgences for sin she sold,
And bartered Heaven itself for gold;
Yet, still she feasted, drank and sang,
And still her joy-bells loudly rang,
And still she revelled in her hall,
Nor dreamed that she was doomed to fall.

But, lo! a potent angel came,
And, stretching forth his wings of flame,
The earth was lightened with his rays,
And Rome stood trembling in amaze.
Then, LUTHER raised his mighty voice,
And bade the heavens and earth rejoice;
"Fallen is BABYLON!" he cried,
With all her trumpery and pride.

Since that bright day of Reformation,
She long became the habitation
Of screech-owls—night birds still complaining—
Of jesuits skilled in plots and training—
Of satyrs grim and doleful creatures—
Of priests with gaunt and rueful features—
Roaming through bogs and mountain glens,
And doling masses in their dens.

Three hundred years had scarcely past,
When, lo! another beast at last
Rose from an Abbey near the main,
A fitting place! called Derrynane.
On that romantic, ruthless shore,
Where the Atlantic waters roar,
The pirate Monks amidst the foam
First found and brought the creature home.

Soon as he grew to beastly prime,
They sent him forth in fitting time;
Praying that he might never lack,
They tied their pouches on his back;
Placed the big O'! before his name
That men might marvel at his fame,
While he revived the ancient power
Which would the nations all devour.

Oft like the lamb he mildly spoke,
Enticing thousands to his yoke;
Then, like the dragon in his ire,
Would vomit smoke and streams of fire—
Blacken and scorch both Church and State,
And stamp, and rage, and mock and hate
All who had hearts to understand,
And spurned to bear his Popish brand.

High was his head and long his tail,
Clad in the first beast's coat of mail—
King of the proud and wicked—he
Would never bend his scaly knee,
Unless, when Rome came forth, to ride,
And shew herself in purple pride.
Then, in the miry street he'd fall,
To lift her ladyship withal.

With massy bit of Irish mould,
She filled his mouth—'twas purest gold;
But when 'twas empty, he would roar—
Bellow his vast exploits once more—
Sing softening strains of liberty,
"Ye bondsmen, all who would be free,
"Themselves must strike the mighty blow,"
And conquering, on to conquer go.

Securely now, she rode anew,
And flaunted in her scarlet hue,
And made her boast from sea to sea,
"A mighty Queen again I'll be!
I will regain my ancient strength,
And burn the heretics at length,
Or make them swallow and adore
The *host*, which they despised before."

Now on she galloped at full speed,
Heedless of what high heaven decreed,
That in her tumult she should fall,
And "never more be found at all."
In one fell moment came her doom,
For, stumbling on JOHN WESLEY'S tomb,
She broke her neck and killed the beast,
And left the fowls of heaven a feast.

Where is she now? ye martyrs say,
And hail this grand millenial day!
The very ground on which she trod,
Is consecrated now to God,
The splendid temples which she built,
Fruit of ambition, craft and guilt,
Are houses now of praise and prayer,
While God *alone* is worshipped there.

Where is she now? ye happy saints,
Who long have uttered vain complaints—
Ye clergy, landlords, merchants tell,
For to your cost ye knew her well,
Her combinations now are gone—
Her agitations all are done;
Nor shall her blighting whirlwinds more
Produce confusion and uproar.

Fallen is Babylon the Great!
And with her, scornful pride and hate:
While tumult, perjury and crime
No more pollute this happy clime.
Her mighty champions—men of fame,
Have sunk in silence and in shame:
Their bubbling names, fled like a dream,
No longer float on memory's stream.

Now, all in heaven and earth combine,
Holy Apostles and Prophets join—
Parents and children—Church and State,
To triumph at great Babylon's fate ;
Her vile confessional no more
The family secrets shall explore ;
Nor shall our mountains, plains and glens,
Display the blight of Peter Dens.

Now railroads, mines, and ports of trade,
A source of wealth are jointly made,
While Erin sings for joy that she
Is from her withering breath made free.
The Shannon, Liffey, Boyne, and Foyle,
Flow gladly through their ancient soil,
And in their streams have borne away
The idols of a former day.

No more the Bible shall she burn,
Or bury it with unholy scorn—
No more corrupt old age and youth
By vain traditions void of truth.
Her mystic masses are no more,
In unknown tongue, now mumbled o'er ;
Her purgatorial fire is dead,
And no more kindles fancied dread.

Her candles and her tapers fine
No longer gild the altar's shrine,
Nor mock the parent of mankind,
As if, in sun-shine, he were blind.
The bridegroom and the bride no more
Shall at her altar steps implore
A wifeless priest to tie a band
Forbade to him by her command.

Relics shall now no more be sold,
Nor souls be auctioned out for gold :
Her pedlars and their stalls are gone,
And holy trinkets are unknown.
Her craftsmen all have failed to frame
An image with a Christain name,
Her millstone now has ceased to sound,
And wheaten gods no more are ground.

Her mirth is hushed, her music fled,
Her Popes and piping Priests are dead.
Her organs, fiddles, flutes are all
Untuned and dead to music's call.
Her Jewish trump of jubilee
Shall sound no more from sea to sea ;
Nor shall one votary every go
To Rome again to kiss her toe.

Queen of the earth! In Erin's isle
How thou didst tyranise awhile;
Doom it to barren hills and plains,
And hold its peasantry in chains.
Dazzle their sense and make them bow,
And tremble 'neath thy frowning brow,
And count their beads, and pay their dues,
And curse them if they dared refuse!

Where? where is now the altar-stone,
Priest, censor, incense?—all are gone.
Cowls, frocks, and albs are thrown aside,
And rites performed in ghostly pride.
Crosses and sacred trees and wells,
Rosaries, pictures, baptised bells,
And holy water, oil, and bone
Are all forgotten and unknown.

Fallen is Babylon and dead!
Earth, from her weighty curse now freed,
Heaves in its mighty orb no more,
But lightly runs its journey o'er.
Truth, peace and unity prevail,
While all men wonder at her tale;
But none can scan the mystery
Why God ere suffered her to be.

Cork, August 28. 1839. DANIEL M'AFEE.

Purcell & Son, Printers.

THE APOSTACY

OF THE

REV. RICHARD WALDO SIBTHORP, B.D.,

FROM

PROTESTANTISM TO POPERY

DEMONSTRATED,

IN AN ADDRESS TO THE

PROTESTANT OPERATIVES OF GREAT BRITAIN.

BY

THE REV. DANIEL M'AFEE,

AUTHOR OF "LETTERS TO O'CONNELL," &c.

"I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say."—1 Cor. x. 15.

BELFAST:
PRINTED BY JAMES WILSON, 70, HIGH-STREET.
1842.

THE APOSTACY,

&c.

My Fellow Protestants,—Permit me to address you, and direct your attention, in the briefest manner I possibly can, to the apostacy of the Rev. Richard Waldo Sibthorp from the *religion* of the *Bible* to that of the *Romish Church.* You are the children of the Reformation—the offspring of Protestant ancestors—several of you the descendants of martyrs and confessors, who counted not their lives dear unto them, but sealed the truth with their blood. At a former period, your fathers were practically acquainted with the dogmas, mummeries, and insidious arts of Popery. It was literally preached and written out of your highly-favoured land; books and tracts, written against its pernicious influence, were found in every house and in every hand; and it finally became impossible for the most wily priest to make converts, because the people were aware of their devices. The man of sin at that time was driven to the caves and fastnesses of Ireland. Here he took up his abode, dwelt in mud-wall cottages, celebrated the mysteries of his earth-born religion, recounted his ancient achievements, sighed over his fallen glory, boasted secretly of his hereditary rights, talked of regaining his former inheritance and spoils; and, in the course of ages, having recruited his numerical strength, through the primary agency, subtilty, falsehood, and bragadocia of his first-born son, O'Connell, abetted by the Irish priests, he gained emancipation from his bondage, in 1829. What, then, has been the result of this? Gratitude to a Protestant Government and to a Protestant people? Quite the reverse. It has been increased hatred to Protestant institutions, extensive organization to raze them to the very foundations, the establishment of counter institutions, and deep-laid plans to spread and establish Popery throughout this Protestant empire. Hence the formation of the Catholic Institute, the swarms of Irish priests sent over to delude you, the number of Popish chapels daily arising in your country, and the unwonted zeal of various agents to impose on your honesty and credulity. In addition to this, the god of this world has mightily assisted the Romish Jesuits, to blind the minds of the Oxford Tractarians, and through the pride of unsanctified learning, to introduce Popery without a Pope, and corrupt the national church, at the fountain head of literature. Under the influence of these several combined causes, you have before your eyes the hateful apostacy of several clergymen, and among the rest, Mr. Sibthorp, who has lately published some of his reasons for

becoming a Popish priest. When men of education, high family connexions, reputed piety, and even some standing in the national church, are led away by the seductive arts of Popery, there would be nothing marvellous, if you, who handle a spade, drive a plough, guide a helm, or use the tool of the artisan, should feel a little bewildered in your judgment, and stand in danger of being bewitched by the enchanting allurements of the great Mother of Harlots. I would, therefore, appeal to your common sense—to that which guides you in the every-day affairs of life.—Exercise it in relation to religion—bend it down to the familiar arguments now to be laid before you.—Religion came from the great author of all, was designed for every man; it was intended as a revelation to common sense—to the good sense of the multitude. To you I write. With the wise and learned I have now no direct business. Hear me, therefore, and I will demonstrate to you, as plain as can be, that poor Mr. Sibthorp is deluded,—that the God of revelation and reason really could not be the author of the faith he has now embraced,—and that it is repugnant to his attributes, word, spirit, church, and people.

It was only in the latter end of January I learned, in Liverpool, that Mr. Sibthorp had sent his reasons for turning Papist into the Christian world. The pamplet is now in its second edition. I am sorry I did not meet with it sooner. I read it first with avidity, and afterwards with cool deliberation;—I marked its tendency on the minds of those unacquainted with Popery, its plausability, its strain of piety, its apparent candour, its real or assumed spirit of charity; and coupling these things with the name, former piety, and respectable character of the author as a minister—nay, a reputed evangelical one, of the Established Church, I resolved at once, that the poison, sweetened with some portions of truth, should receive an antidote. I was the more led to this, because Mr. Sibthorp tries to ground his change of mind on Scripture. It seems, that, about five years ago, he began "A Review of the Jewish Economy," and the result is, he has forsaken both Moses and Christ, and taken shelter under the wings of the pretended successor of St. Peter. It will be seen in the end, whether Moses, who appeared with Elias on the mount, bade him listen to Christ or Anti-christ. There seems to me a slight smell of Jesuitism in pretending to deduce his convictions from Moses. Be it noted, that the Church of Rome never repairs to tradition, or to her own authority, for proof, while she can find the semblance of Scripture to support her. She acts piously and craftily in this! This was one of the first lessons Mr. Sibthorp learned from his new mother. He takes no notice of the "Tracts for the Times," as having expanded his enquiring mind. His pamplet, however, has this strange title—"Some answer," not all, "to the enquiry—Why are you become a Catholic?" There is something of craft in this; it is not—Why are you become a Papist? He wishes you, from the very title page, to believe he has just happily stepped from a particular church into the church universal. If so very catholic or universal, may we not ask, how he could pos-

sibly be out of it? Did he come from another planet, or where did he live on the face of "this huge rotundity," that he was not included, heretofore, in the universal church? Oh! he has just found his way into the universal, and always visible, church of Rome; and, by the very fact of his going, he proves her to be nothing but a particular church; and it is my business to show you that she is a *very particular* bad one! My notions and his differ very widely about her. According to his own shewing, he has now arrived at Mount Zion—the city of God—the heavenly Jerusalem—the very holy of holies—the altar—the sacrifice—the ceremonies—the worship—the High Priest and Pope of Christianity, who is the centre of unity, light, and glory! Such are the extatic views of this enthusiastic novitiate. Examine steadily, however, and you will find he has only arrived at Rome—at the city seated, not like Jerusalem, upon one hill, but upon seven—that he has arrived at Babylon the great—that he has taken his seat on the beast with seven heads and ten horns, behind the Great Mother of Harlots, and abominations of the earth—that the old lady so graphically described by St. John has so imposed the dazzling images of her magic lantern on his distorted vision, that he fancies them to be heavenly realities. In one slide the Pope is the exact fac-simile of the Jewish High Priest! In another, the Jewish altar and sacrifice exhibit the Popish altar, and a sacrifice of bread! A third goes into her lantern, and the seven golden candlesticks of the holy of holies, returned into seven sacraments! A fourth shews the land of Canaan to be a type of the universality of Rome; and another exhibits the Great Mother of Harlots as the bride and the Lamb's wife, after she has made herself drunk with the blood of the saints, and driven the true bride into the wilderness for 1260 days! Is it any wonder, now, that the whims of a vitiated imagination should prepare this bachelor of divinity for all the austerities of external sanctity—for severe mortifications of the body—for incessant repetition of prayers, over a long string of beads—for mortified looks, extraordinary acts of apparent humility, contempt of the world, and perpetual canting about the true centre of unity, and high-flown inspirations of sublime but nonsensical divinity!

It seems, that "many earnest and candid enquirers" proposed the query to Mr. Sibthorp, "Why are you become a Catholic?" As he ranks these among his "dear friends," it is likely that Doctors Pusey, Newman, and Hooke were among the number. If so, he says, in his opening sentence, "You enquire of me the reasons of my secession from the Anglican to the Catholic church." This is the church out of which there is no salvation, no holy orders, no sacraments, and no apostolical succession. Hence, his "dear friends," Pusey, Hooke, Newman, and all the Tractarian Clergy, are left in the mire of heresy and schism. Their holy orders are nullified, their sacraments declared invalid, and the burnished chain of their apostolic succession, is melted to dross in the purgatorial fire which Mr. S. has found kindled at Rome! Such is the import of his first sentence. If the charity of his new religion be such to his friends,

what must it be to his enemies?—The old fire of Smithfield. He has left, however, the Anglican church—the church of the Reformers, of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Hooper; and where is he gone? To the Catholic church, to be sure! This is his answer; but it is our business to follow him—to unfold the falsehood of the reply—to depict the faith he has left, and that which he has embraced, and thereby judge of his assumptions, and the futility of his pretended reasons.

"The Bible, the Bible," said Chillingworth, "is the religion of Protestants." But, what does the Bible say concerning Mr. Sibthorp's becoming Papist? In 1st Tim. chap. iv. 1, he, with others, is surely included—"Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times *some* shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats." How far Mr. Sibthorp has departed from the faith, is now the question. That he has united himself to a church which, 1. Forbids her *Popes*, *Bishops*, and *Priests*, of which he is one, to *marry;* and, 2. Her *entire community* to *abstain* from *meats* during Lent, and certain days of the week, there is not the *slightest doubt.* These two marks are given by the Holy Spirit, as a key to all the rest. Where, then, shall we find the articles of his new creed? He has departed from the faith of God's Word, from that contained in the Thirty-nine Articles of the national church, and he has laid hold of the Popish faith. His new creed is furnished to our hand; we have it in that of Pope Pius IV. This Pope brought the Council of Trent to a conclusion. It began its sittings in the year 1545, under Pope Julius III. and ended in 1563. It had twenty-five sessions in the course of those eighteen years. Let it be observed, that Luther commenced the Reformation in 1517. In the course of a few years, the genuine Protestant principles were developed and established in the minds of the people. Popery, in its new creed, was never confirmed and fully established, as it now is, until the Council of Trent pronounced its last *anathema;* and hence Protestantism, which had been corrupted by Popery, developed itself anew, forty years before the creed of Popery was confirmed by that infamous council. The Popish religion may, therefore, be very properly dated from the year 1563. The new creed of Pius IV. was published at Rome, in the Apostolic Chancery, on the 9th of December, 1564, one year after the Trent infallibles had finished their work. This creed of Pius is a mere abstract and confirmation of what the council devised. It is contained in a Bull entitled—"The Bull of our sacred Lord, Pius the Fourth, by Divine Providence Pope." It runs thus:—

1. "I most steadfastly admit and embrace the Apostolical and Ecclesiastical traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same church.

2. "I also admit the Holy Scriptures according to that sense which our holy mother the church has held, and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.

3. "I also profess, that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the

new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one; to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony; and that they confer grace; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid sacraments.

4. "I embrace and receive all and every one of the things, which have been defined and declared in the Holy Council of Trent, concerning original sin and justification.

5. "I profess, likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation.

6. "I also confess, that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament.

7. "I constantly hold, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

8. "Likewise, that the saints, reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invocated, and that they offer prayer to God for us, and that their relics are to be had in veneration.

9. "I most firmly assert, that the images of Christ, of the Mother of God, ever Virgin, and also of other Saints, may be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration is to be given them.

10. "I also affirm, that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

11. "I acknowledge the holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, as the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; and to the Pope of Rome, successor of the blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ, *I promise and swear* true obedience.

12. "I also firmly receive and profess all other things, which, by the sacred Canons, and general Councils, and especially by the most holy Council of Trent, are delivered, defined, and declared; and all things contrary to them, and all heresies whatever, that by the church have been condemned, rejected, or anathematized, I likewise condemn, reject, and anathematize.

13. "This true Catholic faith, without which no man can be saved, which of my own accord I now profess and truly hold, I the same N. do *promise, vow, and swear*, that I will carefully hold and confess the same entire and inviolate, most constantly, by God's help, to my latest breath, and as far as in me lies, that I will take care it shall be held, taught, and preached by all those who are subject to me, and by those the care of whom in my office shall belong to me.—So help me God, and these holy Gospels of God, &c."

Such is the creed which Mr. Sibthorp has sworn to believe!—A man educated in Protestant principles, having the Bible in his hand from infancy—a minister of the Protestant Church of these lands, at one time an evangelical one, too, and a person of reputed piety. What, then, does he swear?—By the 1st article, he swears, in substance, *I believe in the Pope!* In the 2d, he swears that the plainest declarations of Scripture are inferior to the judgment of Popes, Bishops, and Priests! In the 3d, he swears that the Pope and Councils have authority to add *five* sacraments to the *two* instituted by our Lord, and that all the ceremonies and mummeries connected with them are of divine origin! In the 4th, he swears that justification, or pardon of sin, is by works, and not by faith, or by a mixture of faith and works together! In the 5th, he swears that the body, blood, soul and divinity, of Christ, is turned into a piece of

bread—that it can be in heaven and on ten thousand altars at the same time—that a man can make his maker—and that this piece of bread is a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead!!! In the 6th, he swears that Christ was wrong when he instituted the sacrament in two kinds, instead of one! In the 7th, he swears that Purgatory is a substitute for Christ's blood—that St. John did not speak truth when he said, "The blood of Jesus Christ, his son, cleanseth us from all sin,"—and that it is an excellent invention for gaining the money of the faithful! In the 8th, he swears, that four different persons—one in the wilds of America, another in the deserts of Africa, a third in the jungles of Asia, and a fourth on the plains of Europe, may all pray to a departed saint at one and the same instant, and each be distinctly heard. In the 9th, he swears that idolatry is no sin; and hence that the second commandment should be kept out of the ten, and the ninth divided into two, to make up the number! In the 10th, he swears, that the Pope has power, if handsomely paid, to remit a man's sins, past, present, and to come! In the 11th, he swears, that a particular church is universal—that the Romish Church was the mother of the church at Jerusalem, although the latter existed before the former was founded,—that the Pope is successor to Saint Peter, although he denies his doctrine; and that he ranks far above Peter, being the Vicar of Christ upon earth. In the 12th, he swears, that the Council of Trent was infallible—that it could not err in adding to the Word of God, and that the curses of those who are cursed of God, for adding to, or taking from, the Divine Testimony, are all valid and godly! And, finally, he swears, that all Protestants, of every sect and party—that the members of the national church, and even all Puseyites, who do not subscribe to every iota of this creed, must be damned! That this gentleman believes, or fancies he believes, this new Trent creed, we have the evidence of his oath. The absurdities of it are now stated; and, if we examine the articles in detail, it will be found, that none of you has the slightest reason to follow him, any more than you would an insane person, or a fool. Let me, then, devote a section to each of the leading points included in this creed.

Section I.—Tradition.

When Mr. Sibthorp swears, that he "steadfastly admits and embraces the Apostolic and Evangelical traditions" of the Church of Rome, he not only renounces the 6th Article of the Church of England, but thereby appeals to heaven, that he believes the Scriptures are not a *perfect* and *sufficient rule of faith*. The Council of Trent declares, session 4, "That the doctrines of the Gospel is contained in the written word, and in unwritten traditions; and that they do receive and honour the unwritten traditions, whether appertaining to faith, or manners, with the same reverence and holy affection as they do all the books of the Old and New Testaments." Here the unwritten traditions of the Church of Rome are put on

the same footing as the word of God, and equal reverence and affection are expressed; their whole practice, however, proves, that they value tradition more. If not, why have they, in all ages, locked up the Scriptures from the laity? Why have they called them a dead and killing letter—a shell without a kernel—a Delphic sword—a leaden rule—a shoe fit for any foot—Sibyll's prophesies, Sphynx's riddles, and books of contention and obscenity? Mr. Sibthorp has now declared before the world, that tradition is to be honoured and reverenced with equal honour—that the word of God is not a complete *rule of faith*. From whom did he learn this? Not from God, but from the Church of Rome. Hear, then, the testimony of God on this point—"And that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith, which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousnes: that the man of God may be *perfect*, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."—2d Tim. iii. 15—17. "The *Law* of the Lord is *perfect*, converting the soul; the *Testimony* of the Lord is *sure*, making wise the simple."—Psalm xix. 7. "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me."—John v. 39. Here, now, is the plain testimony of the Spirit of God to the sufficiency of his own word to make wise unto salvation, perfect the soul, and prepare for eternal life. Why was Mr. S. not satisfied with this? because he listened to other instructors, who deceived him, as satan had deceived them. A few quotations will suffice in proof of this.

The Council of Trent, in the 21st session, chap. 1. declares, "That this power hath the church always had, in ministering of the sacraments (except their substance), to *ordain* or *alter* that which she judged *most expedient*, for the ultility of those that receive them." Again, in session 24, canon 3,—"If any man saith, that there are no more degrees of consanguinity and alliance than what are expressed in *Leviticus*, that can hinder from contracting of marriage, or separate that which is contracted, and that the *Church* (of Rome) *cannot dispense* with these degrees, nor *ordain* that many other degrees hinder or separate the marriage, *let him be accursed.*" Gregory of Valence, in the fourth tome of his commentaries, declares, "Many things, in these *latter times*, are *better ordained* in the church than they were in the beginning." Charles Bovius, in his remarks on the 7th book of the Apostles' Constitutions, says, "The Church of Rome, challenging to herself Apostolical authority, *can change* and *alter every thing* to better, according to the condition of the times." Andradius, in his defence of the Trent faith, declares that "His ancestors, being more excelling in piety, *have broken* and *annulled many decrees* of the Apostles." Cardinal Bellarmine, in writing against Barkley, writes, "In good sense and judgment, Christ hath given to Peter (and consequently to the Pope) the power of making that to be sin which is no sin, and that which is no sin to be sin." Again, in another part of his writings,

he asserts, "If the Pope erred in commanding vices, and forbidding virtues, yet the church should be obliged to believe that the vices are good, and the virtues evil, unless it should be against the conscience." Pope Innocent the Third declares, concerning himself, "We may, according to the *fulness of our power*, *dispose* of the *law* and *above* the *law*." Vasquer, the Jesuit, in tome 3, Disput. 216, avers, that "The church and sovereign Pontiff, may abolish and break the Apostles' commandment, because the Apostles' power to give precepts hath not been greater than the Pope's." Peter Charron saith, "It is unjust to require all to be proved by Scripture;" and again, "Scripture is but a little parcel of truth." Again, the Jesuit Caster asserts, "Christ was not pleased to commit his mysteries to parchment."

Here we have Popes, Cardinals, and commentators, in defence of Popery, raising their voices against the God of heaven, doing away with the authority of his word, setting up vain traditions in opposition to, or above, his commandments, and claiming a power for one Pope to invent a dogma, which becomes a tradition to another. The blasphemies of this vile system are abominable. The doom of such, however, is denounced. The following Scriptures speak with a voice of thunder. Let Mr. Sibthorp hear and see if God will treat with impunity those who put traditions on a par with, or set them above, the word of truth:—"Ye shall not add unto the word, which I command you; neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you."—Deut. iv. 2. "What things soever I command you, observe to do it; thou shalt *not add* to it, *nor diminish* from it."—Chap. xii. 32 "Add not thou unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar."—Prov. xxx. 6. "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed."—Gal. i. 8. "For I testify to every man that heareth the word of the prophecy of this book, if *any man* shall *add* unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the Holy City, and from the things that are written in this book"—Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

What do you now say to the first article of Mr. Sibthorp's new creed? It is not Scriptural—it is repugnant to it; and yet he has sworn to believe it! Is he not deluded by the scarlet lady who deceives the nations? But it may be said, do not the Scriptures speak of traditions? Certainly; for 1. The word is used by the Apostle (2d Thes. ii. 15) to express that same Gospel he had previously taught them. 2. It is indicative elsewhere of the written word:—In Acts vi. 14, it relates to the writings of Moses. The customs of Moses there being the same as his traditions. In 1st Cor. xv. 3, what the Apostle orally delivered, is expressly limited to be *according* to the *Scriptures*. 3. In Mat. xv. 2. it is used by our Lord to express the common *usages* of the pharisees, of whom

he immediately complains that they had "made the commandments of God of none effect by their traditions." If a tradition is in accordance with the Word of God, it then may be willingly admitted; but it is still not of equal authority. If it be against the divine word, like those of the Church of Rome, it is then to be rejected with abhorrence. Why does she adhere to traditions of this kind? Because she has no other method of proving her false and absurd doctrines. Her traditions are a mere nonentity. If they be written, let her produce the book, and we will examine them by the Scriptures. If they be unwritten, then who are the keepers and conveyancers? If the whole laity be meant, then whether are those traditions lodged in every head, or distributed in separated ideas throughout the whole? If one peasant, for instance, in Kerry Tipperary, or Kent, knows the whole, would he not be fit for a Pope? If the whole of the millions of the Popish Church constitute the repository of these legends, then who is to abstract, collect, and combine them into a tangible form of truth? Are they confined to the priests and bishops?—then how can they all combine without a general council? If they did assemble, could it be proved that no man lost any of them—none of them ever altered them—that not one of these infallible, holy fathers ever forgot or falsified, added to or kept from, the traditions he received? If not, they must be blessed with extraordinary memories! Is the Pope—infallible old man!—the repository? Then he must truly have the organ of tradition. There must be a something very peculiar in his pericranium. What becomes of the traditions when he dies? Does he send them back in an intellectual parcel from purgatory to his successor?—or, are they all linked to the chain of Apostolical succession?—or, does the soul of one Pope transmigrate into the body of another, and carry the traditions in succession into the holy see? If so, when three Popes reigned at once, had they only one soul among them? Like the consecrated bread, was that soul in three distinct bodies and places at one and the same instant? Can Mr. Sibthorp, with all his faith, receive these absurdities? They are not more absurd than his Apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, which are nothing but the whims and imaginings of men of corrupt minds, who have departed from the faith contained in the written word.

Section II.—Infallibility.

We come now to the second article in Mr. Sibthorp's new creed. It denies the plain sense which God has inspired into his word. It tells you, ye people of England, that ye are destitute of common sense,—that ye cannot understand the very God that made you, unless "Holy Mother Church" makes plain what he says. This article tells you, that you must see with a priest's eyes, hear with his ears, taste with his palate, and judge with his judgment. Ask him, if he himself be infallible, and he will answer, no;—he will inform you that his church is, however, and

that he is ordained to give you her judgment. This, in effect, is to tell you, "I am the town clock—I am wound up and regulated by an invisible hand—a *living and infallible tribunal*—and therefore you are to regulate your private watches by me; or you are not to wear them at all—to exercise at no time your right of private judgment." It follows from this, that whatever equation of time there may be between him and the dial of God's word, should he be twelve hours faster, or twelve slower—should he point to the midnight of Popery, instead of the full blaze of Gospel noon, you are to believe him always right, while the sun and moon, Christ and the true church, are both wrong, because they do not regulate by him! Here the Man of Sin sets himself up above God; he calls upon you to deny the evidence of sense—to extinguish your judgment, and drown your reason in the absurd belief that his church is infallible! If reason must be exercised in listening to his arguments and testimony—in receiving the dogmas of his tradition, might it not be used to better purpose in coming at once to the fountain of the divine word, and thereby to drink in the truth at the hand of Christ himself? The true church must certainly have an *infallible*, *living*, *never dying*, almighty, and *omniscient head*—that head is Christ. She must also have an *infallible rule*—that rule is the *word of God*. To him the church is accountable whether she abides by this rule or not. He sees all, and will judge all in the end. The great error of Mr. Sibthorp's church is, that she puts herself in Christ's place, substitutes her traditions for his word, anticipates the final judgment, claims the obligations which are due to him alone, and pretends to do now what Christ alone will do in the final day—decide all controversies, and show who is right and who is wrong. A few more remarks on the absurdity of her claims, will show you the folly of the choice made by Mr. S.:—

I. Let us now inquire, why is it the Church of Rome should claim infallibility? Is it because she is a church? Then any other church may claim it on the same ground. Is it because she was planted by the Apostles? Then the churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, were infallible also, because they were planted by the Apostles; and the latter claims Peter especially for her founder. Is it because she says, her pastors have had a regular succession from Peter down to this time? If *mere succession* constitutes infallibility, then the Grecian Church must be infallible. According to this principle, the Jewish High Priest must have been infallible also, for he had a regular succession from Aaron. As Mr. Sibthorp has found out, that the Pope succeeds to the spiritual privileges of the Jewish High Priest, of course he must have been infallible, or the Pope cannot be his successor. If so, we may ask was Aaron infallible when he made the golden calf? As much so as the Pope when he established the worship of images. Was Uriah the High Priest infallible, when he overturned the service of God, and introduced idolatry into the temple? So is the Pope, or son of perdition, when he sits in the

temple of God, and exalts himself above him, by altering his institutions, and turning vice into virtue, and virtue into vice. Was Caiaphas the high priest infallible, when, after an uninterrupted succession of 1500 years, he condemned Christ as a blasphemer? So is the woman who made herself drunk with the blood of the saints. Is the Church of Rome infallible, because Christ said, "on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it?" Then she must prove that Peter was the rock—that he has a succession in her—that he left her his keys—that he gave her power to contradict his own doctrine—that she is the identical church meant—and satisfy all heretics, by true or false miracles, that she is not the gates of hell—and that she is not the fiery, persecuting, successor of the great red dragon, which drove the true church into the wilderness for forty-two months.

II. She says she cannot err in matters of faith, and St. Paul says that she has erred—"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats." Let not Mr. S. be offended at this quotation. Again, to me it decides the question without any more ado. Here are two marks—the one relates to the *priesthood*, the other to the *people*. St. Paul calls these a *departure* from *the faith*. The Church of Rome wears them in conjunction with "ancient heretics," and all the ingenuity of man cannot rub them off. Let us hear no more about infallibility; it is gone; the question is now decided, that she is a fallen church—that she is a prodigal that has assumed independence, and departed from the faith, while amidst all her errors and her rioting she proclaims herself infallible.

III. *Suppose* we *granted* her *infallibility*, she can form no objection that we should go in search of it. This philosopher's stone must be found some where within her precincts. Let us try now to find it. We repair *first* to the people. Not one of them has it. One believes in transubstantiation, another does not. One believes in purgatory, another does not. One believes the Priest is infallible, and another does not. One believes it is lodged in all the priests, if they could be brought together, and another does not. One believes it is in a council, and another does not. One believes it is in the Pope, and another does not. Every man has his own opinion on the subject, and yet condems the Protestant for not believing it is somewhere, though they are not agreed among themselves where it is deposited. Well, but this is not fair! we must repair to the priests themselves, and try and find it out. Here we fancy them all before us—we address the first:—Are you, Sir, infallible?—No. Are you?—No: and so we go over the whole, and receive the same answer. If this infallibility were lodged in any particular priest, of course the first Reformers, and the Crottys, the Crolys, and the Nolans of the present day carried it each and every one along, and hence it will not do to acknowledge the par-

ticular infallibility of any one priest upon the face of the earth. We ascend up to the Bishops in search of infallibility; but how can any one of them have it, seeing each was a priest, and as such could not carry up into a higher office what he did not previously possess? We come now to the Popes themselves. Are any of them infallible? Surely we will find it here. I ask where was the infallibility of the Church of Rome during the interregnum when there was no Pope? Where is infallibility, from the time the Pope dies until his successor is chosen? Where was it when three of them reigned at one and the same time? Which of the three was the true one? According to Athanasius, Pope Liberius subscribed to Arianism. Was he infallible? Honorius, another Pope, was condemned by three general councils, each of which was confirmed by his successor. Was he infallible? Pope John XXII. was charged with heresy, schism, simony, and other foul crimes of the most enormous description, in no less than seventy articles, fifty of which were proved against him, and he was actually deposed? Pray, was he infallible? Gelasius condemned communion in one kind, as the Protestants now do, and yet the Church of Rome afterwards introduced it. Was he infallible? The two principal editions of the Vulgate (now the Latin version acknowledged in the Church of Rome,) were made—one by Sextus V., printed in 1590; the other by Clement VIII., published in 1592. The former was published with a tremendous excommunication against any one who might presume to alter the least particle of it; and the latter, containing 2,000 variations, some of whole verses, and many evident contradictions in the sense, was announced with an anathema equally terrible. Which of these two then was infallible? But we must come down with the Pope to a council, and here we will surely find it! That is, when one, two, three, or four hundred fallibles meet together, they will make an infallible!! So many cyphers disunited are nothing; but put them together, according to the arithmetic taught in the Church of Rome, and they make an infallible unit! Where is infallibility when the Pope and the council separate? The council of Trent had the sanction of the Pope, and yet it confirmed the departure from the faith in prohibiting the clergy from marrying, and in commanding to abstain from meats. Has not council contradicted council, Pope contradicted Pope, and that in their most solemn and important transactions? Have we not the same evidence, for the infallibility of the most corrupt assemblies of the most worldly character, that we have for that of the Church of Rome? Her infallibility is as great an imposture as transubstantiation, and that is among the most ridiculous.

IV. This assumption of infallibility in the Church of Rome is both wicked and blasphemous. It invests ignorance with omniscience, mutability with unchangeableness, sin with holiness, and the veriest folly with wisdom. The infallible Church of Rome, forsooth! that can never err. If she has infallibility in any thing, it is in an obstinate adherence to the greatest errors, and a syste-

matic resistance of the truth. Satan can never err by doing right, and her infallibility seems to be of the same species. In fact, any other infallibility than that which is contained in the Scriptures, is absurd and unnecessary. Who can reconcile the pretensions of Rome with the following declarations?—"Prove all things—hold fast that which is good. Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God; because many false Prophets are gone out into the world. I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say." Is an intelligent layman not to exercise the understanding God has given him in searching the Scriptures, because, forsooth, a priest, who perhaps is neither a man of good sense or of sound learning, tells him, "I am infallible, and you are to be guided by me."

Such is the infallibility of Mr. Sibthorp's new church! How far he himself participates in this special privilege of clergy, let the public now judge. He was evidently fallible in concluding, that the High Priest of the Jews was a type of the Pope, inasmuch as infallibility, as an essential quality, was wanting. He wrote his "answer," however, after infallible hands were laid upon him; and no doubt, according to the logic of Rome, that which was falsehood before, is now turned into truth.

Section III.—Seven Sacraments.

Mr. Sibthorp, has sworn in the next place, that there are truly and properly seven sacraments in the Church of Rome—that they were instituted by Jesus Christ—that they are necessary to salvation—that they confer grace—and that he admits all the approved ceremonies used in their administration. The Council of Trent pronounces an anathema on all who do not admit the same. What then is the meaning of this? That the Apostles, the primitive church, and all who abide by the plain declarations of holy writ, are accursed, because they never acknowledged any sacraments but two—baptism and the eucharist. Because the Jewish tabernacle and temple had a golden candlestick with seven branches showing light in the holy place, therefore, says Mr. Sibthorp, the Church of Rome has "a seven-fold channel of sacramental grace illumined, and illuminating all within her sacred enclosure." Now, suppose we simply said, that the candlestick, as described by Moses with seven branches, was intended, not only for ornament, but, for diffusing the light perfectly throughout the place, and that it was significant, 1. of a dark dispensation; 2. Of the law of God, which is a light to our feet, as the Psalmist expresses it; 3. Of the word of God, to which St. Peter bids us to take heed as unto *a light shining in a dark place* (2 Pet. i. 19); and 4. That it is emblematic of the various gifts and graces of the Spirit of God, which is compared to *seven lamps of fire*, which *burn before the throne* (Rev. iii. 5.) Or, lastly, suppose we apply it to the Churches of Christ, who are spoken of as *holding forth the word of life* (Phil. ii. 15, 16,) would we not come nearer the design than to say it represents seven sacra-

ments, five of which have been added by the corrupt Church of Rome, without the authority of the word of God? This shows, however, how Popery will catch at a mere semblance, in order to impose its falsehoods. Mr. S. might as well have inferred, that because there are seven days in the week, and because Pharaoh saw seven fat oxen and seven kine, seven full ears of corn and seven blasted, in his dreams, that these were intended to represent the seven sacraments of the Church of Rome! There were seven silver trumpets connected with the service of the tabernacle, why are there not seven priests to blow them at the time of Mass, instead of ringing bells, and thus exhibit the Popish communion as the real church militant on earth? The old pharisees were more perfect in this than they, for they always sounded a trumpet before them. Let us, however, examine each of these sacraments, and see if the Church of Rome has really got any sacrament at all, according to the design of the Gospel. "What are the *necessary* conditions for a thing to be a *sacrament?*" says Dr. Challenor in his work, entitled "Catholic Christian." He answers, "1st. It *must be a sacred, visible,* or *sensible sign.* 2ndly. This sacred sign must have a power annexed to it of communicating grace to the soul. 3rdly. This *must be* by *virtue* of the *institution* of Christ." Taking this view given by a Popish writer, let us see if the sacraments, so called in the Church of Rome, were *instituted* by *Christ,* and whether they be a visible or sensible sign.

I. We begin with BAPTISM. This was certainly instituted by our Lord (Matt. xxviii. 19)—"Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and, lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." How is this performed by the priests of Rome? They consecrate the water not only with prayers and invocations, but with a three-fold pouring in of *holy oil.* They *cross* the person to be baptized on the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, neck, and breast. They put *holy salt* into his mouth, to free him from the corruption of sin. The priest *breathes* on him, to drive the evil spirit out of him. He puts *spittle* on his nose and ears, and adds *imposition* of *hands,* while he is anointed with the holy oil on the breast, that no relics of the wicked one may remain in him. A *lighted candle* is put into his hand, and a *white garment* is presented to him. The former is intended to show the light of faith and fire of charity with which his soul is endued, and the latter, the purity and innocence which he then receives. On this we remark—

1. Are these mumeries of divine institution? If so, where did Christ establish them? Were they used in relation to his own baptism, when he went down into Jordan? In these things there can be no virtue; but directly the opposite, because they are not of God. The learned King James tells us a curious story about his own baptism in the Premonition, before his Apology for the oath of allegiance. Page 23, he says, "The Queen, my mother, of

worthy memory, though she continued in that religion in which she was nourished, yet was she so far from being superstitious therein, that at my baptism, although I was baptized by a Popish Archbishop, she sent him word to forbear the use of the spittle, being indeed a filthy, apish trick, rather in *scorn* than *imitation* of *Christ;* and her own very words were, that she would not have a debauched priest to spit in her child's mouth."

2. True baptism initiates a person into the visible church of Christ—into his doctrines, ordinances, and worship. Hence the Apostle says, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death." (Rom. vi. 3.) Into what, let me ask, does the baptism by a priest initiate any one? Into a church that has departed from the faith—into doctrines repugnant to the Gospel—into the present creed of the Church of Rome, devised by the Council of Trent, and issued by Pope Pius IV. Does it not bind a man to receive traditions, believe in the infallibility of antichrist, deny the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and acknowledge seven sacraments instead of two? Does it not call upon him to renounce the evidence of his senses, and believe a piece of bread to be the Saviour of the world, and that this is a true sacrifice, both for the living and the dead? Does it not lay him under obligation to receive the eucharist without wine, to hold that there is a purgatory, to pray to dead saints, worship senseless images, and acknowledge the Mother of Harlots to be the mother and mistress of all churches? Does it not impel him to the use of holy water, beads, rosaries, Agnus Deis, pictures, images, relics, and a round of endless and unmeaning mumeries? Can this then be a true baptism, which is vitiated not only in the matter and form, but in the great design for which baptism was instituted? Surely it is not the baptism of Christ, or of his Apostles.

3. True baptism is an outward and visible sign of inward and spiritual grace; it is also a seal of the righteousness of faith and of the covenant of grace; but the baptism of the Romish Church places the grace in the sacrament or sign itself—denies the righteousness of faith, by making baptism, and not faith, the instrument of justification, and thus confers grace, *ex opere operata,* by the mere thing done. The priest is thus the justifier—the justification or grace is by his work; the ordinance is thus shifted from its original design, and every thing connected with baptism is prostituted to a purpose repugnant to the Gospel. Can this then be the true baptism of the Christian dispensation? Let Mr. Sibthorp reply. Let him defend his initiation into Popery, and show how God can have any connection with a Popish rite, which obliges men to deny the simple faith of the Gospel.

II. Confirmation is the next pretended sacrament in the Church of Rome. "When did Christ ordain this sacrament?" is the first query proposed concerning it, in the abridgement of the Christian doctrine, generally used in the Popish Church. The answer is, "The *the time is not certain*; but Divines *most probably hold,* it was instituted at Christ's last supper." Listen to this lan-

guage of an infallible church! What have *probabilities* to do in the mouth of infallibles? The Council of Trent curses the man to eternal death who does not believe this to be a sacrament instituted by Christ, and yet the whole of these infallible cursers cannot tell when or where Christ instituted it. Confirmation is only administered by a Bishop, and hence Pope Melchiades says, "that as confirmation is given by greater men than priests, so it is to be held in greater veneration than baptism." They may hold it in greater veneration than their own baptism, corrupted and polluted as it is, but to hold an institution of the Man of Sin, who turns confirmation into a sacrament, in greater veneration than the baptism instituted by Christ, is surely blasphemous. The Popish Bishop confirms his flock at the age of seven years; but in what? Is it in Christianity? Nay, but in a false belief, false worship, and wrong practices, unknown to the Gospel of Christ. They are confirmed in open hostility to the simple truth as revealed in the word of God.

III. The EUCHARIST is the next Popish sacrament. This, as held by Protestants, was instituted by Christ—the bread as a sign of his broken body, the wine as a sign of his blood. Christ, however, never instituted the Popish Eucharist. If so, where did he do it? Two things demonstrate without further detail, that the *Popish Eucharist is really no sacrament.* 1. A sacrament is an outward and visible sign; but the bread is turned into Christ's body in the Popish Eucharist—it is the *thing itself.* According to Mr. Sibthorp's new creed, it is *truly*, *really*, and *substantially* the *body* and *blood*, *together* with the *soul* and *divinity* of *our Lord Jesus Christ;*" and hence, as it is *no sign*, but the thing itself, it can be no sacrament, if Challenor's definition be true. 2. It is no sacrament whatever, because it wants the wine. This was essential to our Lord's institution. "And *He* took the cup, and gave thanks, and *gave it* to them, saying, *drink ye all of it:* for this is my blood of the new testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins." What does common sense require more than this? The wine was essential to the eucharist instituted by our Lord,—it is the sign of the blood;—and "without shedding of blood is no remission," saith St. Paul. In 1215, the Church of Rome took the cup away; the Council of Trent confirmed this; and hence, as there is no sign of the blood, there is no sacrament,—and, on their own principles, no grace; and hence no remission of sin. What will Mr. Sibthorp say now to this? Let him answer it if he can.

IV. PENANCE is the next pretended sacrament. In this the devotees of Rome are taught, by some miserable bodily punishment, to satisfy divine justice for sins committed after baptism. Fastings, prayers, alms-deeds, whipping of the body, travelling bare foot, or on the bare knees for a certain time, are imposed on the penitent by the Ghostly Father. Let us hear the infallible Council of Trent. In ses. IV., canons 12, 13, 14, it declares:—"If any shall say, that the satisfaction of the penitent is no other than the faith whereby he apprehendeth Christ to have satisfied for

him; or that God is not satisfied for sins as to temporal punishments, such as he inflicts, or such as are enjoined by the priest, or that we voluntarily endure; or that the satisfactions whereby penitents through Jesus Christ do redeem sins, are not the worship of God, but the traditions of men,—let him be accursed." Here this, ye people of England, and let your good sense judge between the religion Mr. Sibthorp has left, and the one he has embraced. He has sworn to the truth of these canons. He has sworn that a man is not justified by faith alone—that Christ did not fully satisfy the justice of God—that his atonement is not complete—that the creature, sinful and deluded, is associated with the Saviour in this great work—and that the vile penances and traditions of this corrupt church are the true worship of God; and that any man who denies this is accursed! Now, let it be noted, that for this sacrament there is not the slightest foundation in the divine word. The true *penance* itself is a false translation of the Greek word *μετανοια*, which simply means a change of mind, and is translated repentance in our authorised version. The Church of Rome has no classical authority for such a false translation. There are two things essentially included in this sacrament of penance, which require a more minute examination, namely, *Confession* and *Absolution*. In the abridgement of the Christian doctrine already quoted, the following questions and answers are found at page 85:—"What is the *matter* of this sacrament of penace? A. The sins and confession of the penitent. What is the *form* of it? A. I absolve thee from thy sins in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. What are the *effects* of it? A. It reconciles us to God, and either restores or increaseth grace." The order of the affair, then, is this—the penitent first confesses all his sins to the priest; the priest then absolves him; and after this the penance is inflicted. Let us examine these in turn. We begin with

AURICULAR CONFESSION.

To understand the doctrines and institutions of Popery aright, we must continually have recourse to those of Christianity, where we will find the analogy or resemblance, and also discover that the former are *substituted* for the latter. If the Scriptural name be retained, we must carefully examine whether it be the same thing which is meant by that term in the divine word. If the name be altered, still there may be a resemblance; but there is always a substitution of one thing for another. Thus she substitutes *herself* for the *first church*—for the Church of Christ. She puts a living *fallible* tribunal for the *infallible* rule of faith—the word of God. She puts the *Pope* in the same place which she, as a personal Millenarian, fancies Christ should occupy. She substitutes the *wafer* for his *body*, the *fire* of *purgatory* for his *blood*. *Fire* for *blood* is one of her most extraordinary substitutions! She puts the *unbloody* offering of the Host in place of Christ's oblation by *blood*; and to crown the whole, she puts the *priest's pardon* in the place of *God's—penance* for *repentance*; and auricular confession for the

confession of the Gospel, and the true *confession* of *penitents*. There is nothing more extraordinary than her inventive powers; but it must be remarked, that she had long enough time to ponder over the matter, ignorance enough to work on, and the very best assistance that could be afforded to corruption and sin; for as we are told, that a monk gave his aid to Mahomed in framing the Koran, so there is little doubt, that the same monk, namely, the devil, which she falsely says, assisted Luther to "invent the Protestant Church," gave her all the aid of his inspiration and influence.

That a regular system of discipline was practised in the primitive church—that scandalous offences were marked and abhorred—that the offenders were expelled publicly, and only re-admitted on the manifestation of the deepest penitence, accompanied by *public confession* or acknowledgment of the crime; and that, in the face of the whole church, is evident from the New Testament and the history of the primitive ages. In this respect the church had the power of binding or excluding, loosing or re-admitting, and thus of forgiving or retaining the sin, so far as they were offended or scandalised. Popish confession is the corruption of this healthful and ancient discipline. She shifted confession from *public* into *private*—from *mere ecclesiastical absolution* into *judicial*—changed the *minister* into a *priest*—the priest into a *judge*, and the judge into a *God*, forgiving sin, not against the church, but *against Jehovah himself*. Here is her departure from the faith—here is the Man of Sin again exhibited. The Council of Trent confirms this iniquitous proceeding, in not less than nine chapters and fifteen canons, in its 14th session. The 6th and 7th canons are to the following effect:—"Whosoever shall deny that sacramental confession was instituted by divine command, or that it is necessary to salvation; or shall affirm that the practice of secretly confessing to the priest alone; or that it is not necessary to confess all and every mortal sin—including secret offences, and those committed against the two last precepts of the decalogue, and those circumstances which change the species of sin; but that such confession was formerly observed merely as a canonical satisfaction imposed upon him;—let him be accursed." Such is the cursed decree of this cursed, cursing council—a decree without the slightest "warranty from Scripture"—a decree in direct opposition to the authority of God, the practice of the true Church of Christ, the welfare of the world, the spread of the Gospel, and the happiness, morality, and salvation of the Romish Priesthood themselves. On this patent invention of the Church of Rome—this pick-lock of the conscience—this priestly probe forged in the dark and leaden ages of the church, I make the following remarks:—

1. As it *regards* the *Divine Being*, it is undoubtedly a *most blasphemous institution*. Does it not imply:—1. That he is a far off—that our Lord took his journey into a far country, and that he left the Romish Clergy to manage matters for him in his absence, just as they please themselves? If God be *near* at *hand*, why not confess to him, and to him alone? Does not confession to a priest,

who, of course, must be *near*, imply that God is *a far off*—that he is *not present?* Is not this a denial of his omnipotence? and is not this blasphemy? 2. It is a *dishonour* to him as the *Sovereign* and *Governor* of the world. Against him only have we sinned. To him alone we should confess our sins; and hence, auricular confession is a denial of his supremacy, and a substitution of the priest in his stead. By transubstantiation, he creates and commands his creator; and by auricular confession, he robs him of his rights as the governor of the world, usurps his throne, blots out the armorial motto of his empire—"the Lord reigneth," and substitutes his own—the priest reigneth in his stead. Is not this blasphemy? 3. It is a *practical denial* of his *goodness, mercy, loving-kindness*, and *willingness* to *save*. He is "the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin." (Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7.) "And therefore will the Lord *wait*, that he may be gracious unto you—for the Lord is a God of judgment; blessed are all they that wait on him." (Isaiah xxx. 18.) "I waited patiently for the Lord; and he inclined unto me, and heard my cry." (Ps. xl.) "If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth unto all men liberally, and upbraideth not." (James i. 5.) "Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgressions of the remnant of his heritage? He retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in mercy. He will turn again; he will have compassion upon us; he will subdue our iniquities; and thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea." (Micah vii. 18, 19.) The practice of auricular confession and priestly absolution, is inconsistent with all this. It tarnishes the goodness and willingness of God to hear and to forgive; it misrepresents his real, Scriptural character. If this system were true, we ought to be informed of it in the divine word. We should be told that the priest is good, and not evil—that he is merciful, and not cruel—that he is disinterested, and not covetous. We should be commanded to *wait* upon him, and, to be sure, to bring our money along. 4. This system makes the High and Holy Being the *author* of *sin;* for the very system of confession blasphemes his presence and perfections—the promises of his Gospel, and the only plan of salvation by faith alone in the blood of the atonement.

2. *Private confession tends* to *corrupt* the *morals* of the *priesthood, subject* them to *temptation, harden* them in *sin*, and finally *destroy* their *souls*. With an unconverted heart, a carnal nature, unsubdued desires, corrupt passions, a dark and ill-instructed understanding, and the ardent curiosity which nestles in the bosom of all novices; the young priest, fresh from Maynooth, no longer subject to restraint, and glorying in his liberty and privileges, enters the confession-box, becomes acquainted with the secret sins, mortal and venial, with all the circumstances of his parishioners; he now knows not only their characters, but their hearts, their very thoughts, the risings of desire, the buddings of evil, the unhallowed passions, the blasphemous language, the lawless conduct, the mur-

derous intentions of some, the actual criminality of others, the peculiar disposition, the particular immoral tendency, and the besetting sins of all. Wives, widows, mothers, and daughters, all bow before the holy man—the new made priest; the impure streams of a whole district are poured into his ears, and necessarily must raise the mud of unholy thoughts and associations in his heart and imagination. St. Peter said, "I go a fishing;" his successors are fishermen, and hence the devil soon tempts the priesthood (at least this is the opinion almost of every parish in Ireland) to angle in muddy waters. Thousands have actually broken their vow of celibacy. Thanks to the confessional for this! And tens of thousands of the priesthood of Rome have acted in the same manner, whose wickedness, for want of discipline or evidence, is reserved for the investigation of the judgment day. In fact, the natural tendency of this system, as it regards the priesthood, is to impel them into hypocrisy, covetousness, reserve, and high-mindedness; it gives importance to meanness, a spiritual authority to wickedness and illegality, and a tremendous influence to an irresponsible race of men, who, bound by no refined, tender, and strong tie to *legitimate offspring*, are linked to the horns of the Papal beast, as the fit instruments whereby his empire of ignorance, falsehood, and sin, are perpetuated in the world.

3. The *evils* of this system on the peasantry of the country are *incalculable*. "The tree is known by its fruits." What then are the fruits of this forbidden tree? and what have been its fruits in Ireland even for ages? Who can deny that ignorance, wickedness, malice, envy, hatred, ill-will, deceit, murders, burnings, and innumerable evils have abounded, and still do abound? Has not the system of auricular confession mainly contributed to these things? The people confess, and are enslaved; they are held in chains of spiritual bondage, and prevented by the confessional from coming to a knowledge of the truth. Have they opened their eyes to look at the light? the priest finds it out, and they must close them again. If Protestant liberality and Christian piety supplies the peasant with a Bible; it is found out in confession, and being a monstrous sin against the church, the obnoxious book must be "buried with a tongs." If the peasant by stealth, sometimes exercises the common and inalienable right of man, and now and again hears a Minister of the Gospel proclaim the glad tidings of salvation through faith in the atoning blood; it is discovered in the confessional, and a heavy penance imposed. A female some time ago, was sentenced to travel three times round an old graveyard, and that at twelve o'clock at night, for reading the New Testament. The spirit and independence of the peasantry are thus destroyed. There is nothing to be found in the south and west of Ireland like the bold, manly, and independent spirit, which characterises the Protestant peasantry of Great Britain, and of the province of Ulster. Which of these would drop on his knees in the gutter to a priest, or permit him to lay the horsewhip to his shoulder in a fair? Why does not the efficacy of the confessional

put an end to the open Sabbath breaking, the blasphemy, the drunkenness, and the faction fights of the south and west? Are not these peculiar to "the beloved Blackfeet and Whitefeet" of the holy, orthodox, and infallible church? What virtue is there in confession, where the evils are perpetuated from generation to generation, which it pretends to cure. In fact, the people are cheated by it; it is the chief evil of the land itself; it is a veil of darkness cast over their eyes; it is not of the right stamp; it is made in the wrong ear; it springs not from a genuine conviction and sorrow for sin; it is unaccompanied by a lively faith in the sinners only friend; it is crowned by a false pardon; it is associated with a hypocritical and feeble revolution; it covers the sore without healing it; it gives a new death unto righteousness, and a new life unto sin; it only muzzles the tiger while he is in the cage; it pretends to dry up the fountain of corruption, while it leaves the streams of polluted passion gathering with additional force, to overflow with the greater energy, and send forth their fetid and obnoxious vapours, in a more offensive manner, in the presence of high heaven, than before. In a word, the confessional is made an insurance office for sin—a mere money scheme, worse than the south sea bubble; while the priest himself, a spiritual bankrupt, unable to discharge his own heavy debt with the infallible justice of God, pretends to remit the penalty of a law which binds him over to greater guilt on account of the imposition. On the passage urged in behalf of this practice (James v. 16)—"Confess your faults one to another," it is only necessary to observe, that if it relate to Popish confession, the priest is as much bound by it to confess to the people as they are to confess to him. The attempt is vain to produce any proof for this practice from the word of God.

Mr. Sibthorp himself is now become a confessor. He is bound to defend this new practice on which he has entered. I defy him to find the semblance of Scripture to support it, unless the words already quoted. Any of you may confess to him, in case he consents to confess to you, according to St. James. If he does so, be sure to make him confess, that "The Tracts for the Times," and not Moses, led him into Popery—that he became acquainted long ago with Popish priests and Popish authors—that some of the Jesuit kind assisted him to go to press; and above all things, urge him to answer my arguments, until he acknowledges his utter incapability. Should he wish for reference in proof of these remarks on the confessional, refer him to those priests who have forsaken his communion, and exposed the wickedness of the confessional; refer him to Dens' Theology on the subject; refer him to every fair and market in Ireland; refer him to the murderer, who, if he has killed a heretic, dies "as innocent as the child unborn," because he has confessed and received absolution;—and, lastly, point him to the priest in France, who, having half despatched his mistress, gave her absolution, and afterwards severed her body in pieces! Let us now examine, whether a false pardon does not accompany an unscriptural confession, by a few remarks on Popish

Confession contains the *matter* of the sacrament of penance; absolution is called its *form.* As the Church of Rome has claimed a right to alter, add to, or take from, every doctrine and institution of Christ, it is no wonder she should encroach on the prerogative of God in relation to the pardon of sin Our Lord says in one of his parables, that a certain householder planted a vineyard, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country. According to Popery, the certain man is the author of Christianity, the church is the vineyard, and the Popes, Bishops, and Priests, are the husbandmen. These, and these alone, even in despite of the Puseyites, whom they look on as mere herds on a common, are the genuine successors of the Apostles in the occupation of the vineyard; the title-deed is laid up at Rome; and as the original proprietor is not likely to return for a long time, they still continue to root up and to plant, to build and to destroy; and whether they cultivate the grape of Canaan, or the vine of Sodom, it matters not, if they can raise as much off the farm as will support their riotous living. This is their great object; and hence they have cultivated with the utmost care these two plants of confession and absolution, as being among the most profitable, though poisonous, trees to be found of their planting. We have seen some of the bitter fruits and results of the former, let us now examine the nature and tendency of the latter. The following remarks may suffice:—

1. It is evident, that if the successors of the Apostles have the power of remitting and retaining sin *judicially*, that power is not given to the Romish Priesthood above all others in the community. My reasons for saying so are as follow:—1. They do not teach as the Apostles taught. They do not instruct men in the doctrine of justification by faith alone in the blood of the atonement; they do not hold Christ alone as the head; and they pollute the Gospel by mixing with it the traditions of men. 2. They do not *act* as the Apostles *acted.* "Thy money perish with thee," was the language of Peter to Simon Magus, when he wished to purchase the Holy Ghost. Where is the priest who refuses cash for the absolution he pronounces? Let one be produced. Does not every one of them sell the pardon at the highest rate? St. Peter never heard a private confession, nor pronounced a private absolution, nor sent a man on a pilgrimage. 3. They do not *live* as the Apostles *lived.* St. Peter had a *wife;* the priests have only *nieces.* St. Peter was a *holy* man; the majority of priests, and even Popes, have been among the most *unholy*, which the world, let alone the church, ever endured. St. Peter was no lover of "filthy lucre;" where is the priest who is not? Was St. Peter a horse-racer? Did he keep hounds as Father Tom Maguire does? Was he a gambler? Would he play at cards or dice on Sunday evening? Was he a lover of wine and strong drink? Did he ever sing the song of the drunkard at a wedding or christening? Did he ever celebrate a private mass for a brute, and thereby make gain of the

Saviour of the world? Was he a political mountebank, a political speech-maker, in the Temple of God, and that on the Sabbath day? Did he keep the Scriptures back from the people, lest they should condemn his doctrines and practices? I dare any of the priests throughout the land to answer these queries. 4. The priests have neither the same *spirit* nor *power* of the Apostles. On which of them did the Saviour of Mankind ever *breathe?* To which of them did he ever say, "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted?" If so, let them prove that they have "the *discernment* of *spirits*," and then I prove that there is *no need* of confession. Let them strike that heretic dead as Peter did Ananias and Sapphira; let their aprons and shadows heal the sick, and then there will be no use for holy wells and holy trees; let them speak with other tongues—speak it as it is in Christ—and let the Holy Spirit descend on their hearers, as it did on Cornelius and his family under Peter's sermon, and there will be neither "Blackfeet" nor "Whitefeet" either in Carlow or Tipperary. It will not do to have mock miracles, such as those of Hohenloe. It is not the breath of a corrupt mortal can give the Holy Spirit, and make a man a successor of the Apostles. From which of the Popes was this power derived? Was it by the breath of Pope Leo the X., who sold indulgences, denied the being of a God, and called the Gospel a fable, that the priests of that day received the Holy Spirit?—or by the breath of Pope Joan, an English woman, that the priests of her day were made successors of the Apostles?—or by the breath of the three Popes who reigned at the same time, that the priests of that period were rendered infallible? If so, *which* of the *three*, for *each* was *infallible?* Let Mr. S. reply to these questions, or by his silence confess that the priests are the least entitled to the power of the keys of any race of ministers that ever existed in the world. The fact is, they have *no commission* from Christ, nor his Apostles; and hence their absolution is a mere imposition.

2. Let us now give an explanation of the passage—"Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted," &c. Mr. S. may make this demand with the utmost confidence, that I can apply it to no other purpose but that of Popish absolution. I have proved already that he and his brethren have neither lot nor part in the matter. What then does it mean? I answer:—1. If it mean *judicial pardon*, or the *actual power* of *forgiving sin*, it must be confined to the Apostles themselves, who, in this respect, could have no successors. The Apostles certainly had the "*discernment* of *spirits*," and hence could not be imposed on by the *impenitent* and *unbelieving*. Here then is a qualification to which no man can pretend. Let the priests prove that they possess this power, and then we may be inclined to listen to their pretensions. They will not then require to confess the people any more than the Apostles did. Confession itself proves that they are not the successors of the Apostles, inasmuch as they know not the hearts and sins without it. 2. *Judicial pardon* cannot be the meaning of our Lord, because the Apostles never exercised it, and because the thing was impossible in its own

nature. It was not against the Apostles, but against God, that sin was committed. No one can forgive an offence, but the being against whom the offence is actually committed. "God is the one Lawgiver," King, and Judge. Christ alone "openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth." "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and He will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon." "I, even I, am He that blotteth out thy transgressions for my own name sake." The Apostles knew these declarations. They never encroached on the prerogative of God; and hence their remitting or retaining sin was ministerial or declarative, the same as the form of absolution contained in our Liturgy:—"He hath given power and commandment unto his ministers to declare and pronounce unto his people, being penitent, the remission of their sins." Such was the fact in relation to the Apostles. "He commanded us," saith St. Peter, "to *preach* unto the people, that through *his name*, whosoever *believeth* on him shall *receive* the *remission of sins.*" St. Paul testifies to the same effect. "Be it known unto you, that through this man (Christ) is *preached* unto you the *forgiveness of sins;* and *by him* all that *believe* are *justified* from *all things.*" They who preach the same doctrines are the Apostles' successors; the priests do it not; therefore, they are not the ministers of Christ. They have run without being sent. 3. The *remitting* and *retaining sin*, the *binding* and *loosing*, ascribed to the Apostles, includes a power of inflicting and remitting ecclesiastical censures, or of excluding from and re-admitting into a Christian congregation. This is evident from the case of the incestuous Corinthian mentioned in the epistles to that church. Public confession and deep humiliation were required in the offender. The sin was committed against the church, and the Apostles had not only the power to remit the censure, but, in this case, their judgment and decision were ratified in heaven. But what has this to do with private confession and unauthorised pardon by an ignorant and presumptuous priesthood? There is no such thing contained in our Lord's declaration, or warranted by the example of the Apostles.

3. The dreadful evils of priestly absolution cannot possibly be depicted in full. Eternity alone will unfold them. Human invention and authority are substituted in place of the authority of God, and the blessings of his Gospel. Examine the case in all candour. The priest is guilty of mortal sin, and yet pardons the mortal sin of others; he is under the wrath of God himself, and yet lifts it off the consciences of his hearers; he is far from God, and yet he brings them near; he is an enemy to God, and yet can restore others to his friendship; he is one of Pharaoh's magicians, sitting in thick darkness, and yet he can make light shine into every tent of Israel; the gate of heaven is closed against himself on account of his wickedness, and yet he can open it to others; he cannot cast Satan out of himself, but he can out of others;—in a word, he can change penance into repentance, alter the conditions of the Gospel,

justify without faith, pardon on the score of human merit, and restore a man to the forfeited favour of God, by the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, while the righteousness of Christ is unacknowledged and despised! Who then can believe all this? The man who does so is miserably deceived His absolution is a mere breath—a bubble—a counterfeit, and delusion. Were there any virtue in it, why impose a penance, afterwards anoint, and finally say masses for the repose of the soul in purgatory? Some one of all these things must be wrong. Let Mr. S. take his choice; infallibility is destroyed, and the whole fabric of his church tumbles to the ground, leaving nothing behind, but the remains of a heathen temple. Where now are the husbandmen? Gone into a far country, like the prodigal. The master returned at the Reformation, and caused Luther and the Reformers to discard them. Mr. Sibthorp himself is dismissed by his own act from the vineyard; he has departed from the truth, and has gone to cultivate pernicious doctrines in the Pope's farm. The heresies of Puseyism will not be permitted to thrive in a Protestant soil; and they will either soon wither, or their planters will be dismissed also by the Great Head of the church. Their title to the vineyard is fictitious; it is borrowed from Rome, and their Apostolical succession is unknown to the word of God, the great charter of a Gospel ministry. God cannot be with them, because in heart and doctrine they are with Rome. Their doctrines and practices have spoiled their succession, and have showed them to be deluded pretenders, with whom public opinion is beginning already to reckon, even before the master's coming. The confessions, absolutions, and penances, imposed by such men, whether priest or Puseyite, are derogatory to a rational being, offensive to God, and injurious to the community. We have now done with the pretended sacrament of penance, in matter, form, and effects.

V. Extreme Unction is the next pretended sacrament which demands our attention. The Council of Trent, in ses. 14, has the following canons respecting it:—1. "If any one shall say, that extreme unction is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by our Lord Christ, and published by the blessed Apostle St. James, but only a rite received from the Fathers, or a human invention, let him be accursed." 2. "If any one shall say, that the sacred unction of the sick does not confer grace, nor remit sins, nor comfort the sick, but has now ceased, as if heretofore, it were only the gift of healing, let him be accursed." 3. "If any one shall say, that the rite and usage of extreme unction, which the holy *Roman* Church observes, is repugnant to the sense of St. James the Apostle, and is therefore to be changed, and may justly, and without sin, be condemned by Christians, let him be accursed." Let us compare this with another statement made by this council in the same session:—"Instituta est autem sacra hæc unctio infirmorum, *tanquam* vere et proprie sacramentum novi Testamenti a Christo Domino nostro, apud Marcum, quidem *insinuatum* per Jacobum autem Apostolum fidelibus commendatum ac promulgatum." This is

literally as follows:—" This holy anointing of the sick is instituted, *as it were*, a true and proper sacrament of the New Testament; *hinted at*, indeed, by Christ our Lord, in St. Mark, but recommended and proclaimed by the Apostle St. James." To the truth of this statement, and the cursing canons, Mr. Sibthorp, and every priest of Rome, has sworn—sworn that it was *positively instituted* by our Lord; and yet this same council—how infallible!—corrects itself, and says, that it was only *hinted at* in St. Mark. This notable church then can extract sacraments out of mere hints, and curse our common sense, if we do not believe that the *very* hint, however slight, is a positive institution. Let us hear the abridgement of the Christian Doctrine on this point:—" When did Christ institute this sacrament? A. The *time is uncertain:* some think it was instituted at his last supper; others, that it was done betwixt his resurrection and ascension." The writer of this abridgement was well skilled in Popish theology. He knew right well, that his church holds it as a point that the Apostles were not constituted priests until the last supper. The passage in St. Mark, where our Lord is said to give the hint about it, is, " And they anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." (Chap. vi. 13.) The writer of this catechism, therefore, gives up the matter from this text; he sees it makes against him, and hence he answers the question as above, and resolves the time and place into mere opinion. Had he said, it was instituted by our Lord, when he first sent the Apostles forth, then he would acknowledge that the Apostles, while laymen, administered this sacrament, because they were only priested at the last supper. He must, therefore, guard the privileges of his order, even at the risk of the Trent curses. To evade this, however, he agrees with those who think it was instituted at the last supper, or after our Lord's resurrection. Not one of them can tell either time or place, chapter or verse, where it was done, and yet they are infallible! And we must take this infallibility as a proof that the thing was done some time or another. Perhaps Mr. Sibthorp, after all his scriptural research, can tell the time and place where our Lord instituted extreme unction.

This is the last of the money-making sacraments in the Church of Rome. It is called the *sacrament of the dying*, because it is never administered to any whom, in the priest's judgment, may recover. He anoints the patient on the eyes, ears, &c., to take away the sin of each particular sense, saying, " By this holy unction, and by his most holy mercy, God forgive thee whatever sin thou hast committed, by seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, and touching.—Amen." The feet and other parts of the body are also anointed to take away their sins. It is remarkable, that every succeeding rite of Popery destroys and invalidates all that went before. Of what virtue was confession, absolution, penance, and indulgences, when extreme unction is thus required? And what is its virtue when purgatory must follow after? But, we must not forget the proof from St. James. In chap. v. 14, 15, he says, " Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them

pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." Now, as we have no evidence, that extreme unction was instituted by our Lord, is there any in this passage, which proves that St. James first promulgated it? It is manifest at once, that there is an essential difference between the anointing mentioned here, and that of Popish unction. 1. This was done by the *elders*, not priests; for there were no Popish priests in those days;—none who celebrated mass, prayed to the Virgin Mary, worshipped a crucifix, sprinkled holy water, or caused the people to bow down and adore a piece of bread. 2. The Popish priest anoints a man to death; but these anointed him for life—to heal, restore, and raise him up. 3. If by his sins, he was punished with disease, as some of the Corinthians were, for profaning the Lord's supper (1 Cor. ii. 30—32) the faith of these men was accepted; they, no doubt, having the miraculous gift of healing; the man's sins were forgiven, and, being anointed with oil, his body was healed, and he was raised up again from the affliction. This is the plain design of the passage, and it has no more to do with extreme unction than it has with penance or confirmation. This sacrament, therefore, so called, has no "warranty of Scripture;" it is a mere corruption of a wholesome practice and miraculous gift of the primitive church, and was reduced to its present form to uphold the power of the priesthood, and increase their income. Where is the priest who administers this last rite of his church without emolument? In Ireland, they are paid for it every where. It is one of Mr. Sibthorp's golden candlesticks; and if it never adorned the sanctuary of the Lord, it has contributed to make the priest's table rather brilliant on many occasions.

The evils arising from this practical cheat, palmed on millions of human beings, are enormous. It has led the priest to swear a falsehood, teach a lie, and join with the infamous Council of Trent, in sending to perdition, all who do not believe in and receive it. It causes the people to trust in a delusion, even at their final moments—inspires them with a false confidence in man—promises them a virtue which it does not contain—sensualizes the mind in relation to spiritual and eternal things—makes the anointing of the wasting flesh a substitute for the inward unction of the Holy Spirit; and leaves the dying sinner buoyed up with false hopes of meeting the Judge Eternal with a due preparation, while the guilt, power, and pollution of sin, rests upon his conscience. Hence, the eagerness with which the priest is sought after at the approach of dissolution. Midnight darkness—winter storms—the most difficult circumstances, the most impassible barriers—must not retard him. Eternal life, or damnation, is suspended on his presence or absence; and should sickness, death, or any unavoidable cause, prevent the priest from attending, and the patient die without this rite, a settled gloom rests on the countenance of all concerned, implying their dread that his soul is lost. This deep conviction of the efficacy of

extreme unction, accounts for Popish zeal in making converts of Protestants, who may be friendless or neglected on a death-bed. If the priest, under any pretence, can be got to anoint him, a new convert is made, and, in the estimation of the deluded, a soul is saved from death! This has been no uncommon thing in Ireland.

VI. Holy Orders and Matrimony are the two last sacraments on the Popish list. The former relates to bishops, priests, and deacons—the latter to the people. Marriage is made a sacrament to the people, and is denied to those in holy orders. The making it a sacrament without Christ's authority, and the denial of it to the priesthood, are two characteristics of the Man of Sin. There is not the semblance of proof for one or other of these sacraments adduced from the holy Scriptures. Marriage, say they, was made a sacrament by our Lord at Cana of Galilee; and the sacrament of holy orders was instituted where our Lord said, "This is my body which is given for you; do this in remembrance of me." According to this, the Priest receives power to consecrate the body and blood of Christ, present it in the mass, administer the sacraments, serve the altar, and preach. On this principle, the Church of Rome may multiply sacraments *ad infinitum*. It is a wonder she did not institute a sacrament on Christ's flight into Egypt—his temptation—his preaching on the mount—his feeding the multitude—his transfiguration—and his riding into Jerusalem. She would just have had the same authority for any of these as she had for corrupting the two genuine ones, and adding five of her own to the number. But she must have seven, and no more! This was a number of perfection among the Jews, and Mr. Sibthorp has found out that the seven sacraments of Rome are the seven golden candlesticks of the Jewish sanctuary. They might as readily answer to the seven hills of Rome, the seat of the beast. To talk of holy orders in the Church of Rome, is a mere delusion. Did she not forfeit her claim to holy orders by departing from the faith? Holy orders, including a call, and true ordination to the ministry, must come from the God of truth and holiness. Could God then ordain a Pope, Bishop, or Priest, to create his own Son of bread, to consecrate or make him holy, "who was consecrated for evermore?" Could he ordain or appoint a priest to offer him as a sacrifice in the mass, whose sacrifice was completed on the cross? Could he call and ordain a man to preach lies—that men should pray to dead saints—worship images—purchase indulgences—and perform penances to satisfy the justice of God? Could he ordain a man to contradict his own word, delude the souls of men, and turn the religion of Christ into a mere mockery, by substituting unvarnished falsehoods in its stead? Surely not; and hence there are no holy orders in the Church of Rome—none of God. That there are the Pope's holy, or rather unholy orders, there is no doubt. But the two things are quite distinct—the one is substituted for the other. Whatever holy orders poor Mr. Sibthorp might have had, he resigned them all for the priest's alb and stole. He entered into the orders of Antichrist at the celebration of the

first mass, embracing the creed of Pope Pius IV.—he renounced the word of truth as his standard—and received doctrines directly repugnant to the plainest declarations of holy writ.

Section IV.—Justification.

The next article in Mr. Sibthorp's new creed relates to the great leading doctrine of justification. In the 11th article of the Church of England, on this point, it is said, "We are *accounted righteous* before God *only*, for the *merit* of *our Lord Jesus Christ* by *faith*, and *not for our own works* or *deservings*." This is the direct doctrine of the Scriptures. "Therefore, being justified by *faith*, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." "Being *justified freely* by his *grace*, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Therefore we conclude, that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law. "To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." These Scriptures are plain and decisive. They show us that there is no possibility of being pardoned or justified, but by faith alone in the merits of Jesus Christ. Let us now hear the infallible Council of Trent. In session 6, it is declared, "Justification is *not only* the *forgiveness* of *sin*, but also the *sanctification* and *renovation* of the *inward man*, by a *voluntary susception* of *grace* and *gifts*. If any one say, that men are justified, either by the *sole imputed righteousness* of *Christ*, or the *sole remission* of *sins*, exclusive of the *grace* and *charity*, which should be shed in their hearts by the Holy Spirit, and remain in them; or, likewise, that the *grace* by which we be justified, is the *mere favour* of *God*—let him be accursed." Here justification, sanctification, and regeneration, are all confounded together. Why is this the case? To make way for the doctrine of merit taught in the Church of Rome. If a man be justified by faith alone, by the mere grace or favour of God, then there is no room left for penances, priestly pardons, the merit of saints, prayers for their help, purgatory, and indulgences. The Council of Trent guards these abominations, and suspends the justification of the sinner, not on faith, but on "the *voluntary susception* of grace and gifts." It represents him as being justified by what is within himself, and not by the redemption of Christ alone; in other words, the justification is by works, and not by faith. Every man is cursed who does not believe this. St. Paul, now in glory, is cursed by this council. For if every one is cursed who says, "that the *grace* by which we are justified is the *mere favour* of *God*," he must come in for the curse, inasmuch as he expressly says, "Being justified freely by his grace (or mere favour,) through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." This is the doctrine to which Mr. Sibthorp has sworn assent. Let us exhibit the doctrine of merit a little more. The Council of Trent again declares, "If any one say, that the *good works* of a *justified man* are *so* the *gifts* of *God*, that they are *not also* the *good merits* of the *justified man*

himself; or that the justified man himself, by good works, which, through the grace of God and the merits of Christ, are done by him, *does not truly merit* an *increase* of *grace, eternal life;* and if he *depart* in *grace,* the *possession* of *eternal life,* and also an *increase* of *glory*—let him be accursed."

On this passage, let us produce two good comments. The first is from the Theology of the noted Peter Dens. In answer to the question, "What is an indulgence?" he says, "it is the *remission* of *sins*, by the *applying* of the *merits*, or *satisfactions*, that are contained in the *treasury* of the *church.*" In answer to the next inquiry respecting this treasury, it is said to be "The *collection* of *good works*, accepted by God, and the disposal of which is entrusted to the church." Then comes the grand question—"From whence does the hoard of this, the church's treasury, arise?" The reply is, "First, from the superabundant satisfaction of Christ, then from the overflowing satisfactions of the Virgin Mary, and all the other saints." Here now is proof positive of the sentiment advanced, that the Council of Trent so worded its cursing article on justification, as to make room for priestly pardons, prayers to saints, &c. This shows us, that justification in the Church of Rome, is not an act of God's free grace, whereby he remits sin, but an act of the Pope, Bishop, or Priest. It was the act of Leo. the X., when he commissioned Tetzel to sell indulgences. Tetzel, and not Christ, conveyed the pardon. Money, and not faith, was the condition of receiving it. It cannot, therefore, in her creed, be the mere grace, or favour of God, by faith. It is the same in penance, absolution, extreme unction; these convey the grace, and money is the condition. A Romanist, therefore, justifies himself, and the whole system also, makes the one justify the other. It is worthy of remark, from the statement of Dens, which is the correct view of the whole church, that as the remission of sins, in an indulgence, is obtained, not merely from the overflowing satisfactions of the Virgin Mary, but of *all the saints*, so all who have gone before, contribute to the justification of all who remain behind, and hence, those who happen to live now, have a far greater ground of confidence than the Apostles and primitive Christians! On this principle, we may account for the superior sanctity of Mr. Sibthorp, and the Jesuits, who are now sowing the seeds of their doctrine in England. Mr. Sibthorp did not feel at home in a church which was spiritually poor, and hence he repaired to one where the saints keep one common stock-purse—where the "celestial treasury" is full, and where a man, by putting a mere trifle in, can benefit by the accumulated wealth of thousands, going on at the rate of compound interest, from the times of the Apostles up to the present period. Dens tells us, that this treasury is at the disposal of the church, viz. of the priests. Happy men that they are! They have the merits of all the saints departed, in their hands. Their power, therefore, extends into the invisible world. It is impossible to tell but that they may have got the management of the Jewish, Mahomedan, and Pagan funds also. For as the Apostles succeeded the Jewish Priests, and the priests

were the children of Abraham, and Abraham came from the land of Ur, where idolatry prevailed, they can make out their claim on the Jewish and pagan saints; and as Mahomet was assisted by a monk—no doubt one of Rome—the connection is easily traced, so as to claim the merit of the saints of Ali! These gentlemen will surely assist themselves largely, as they can claim an interest at first cost. A Papist, and especially a priest, therefore, who fails in the end, must be a sinner of unbounded iniquity.

I proposed another comment, however, on the canon of the Council of Trent. It is found in a burial ground in the city of Cork, where the writer had an opportunity of reading it. It runs thus:—"Sacred to the memory of the benevolent Edward Molloy, &c. He employed the wealth of this world only to secure the riches of the next, and leaving a balance of merit in the book of life, he made heaven debtor to mercy." This epitaph is dated 1818. Let not the reader startle at this. The language is strong, but the sentiments are strictly orthodox, according to the decree of the Council of Trent. It exhibits in one sentence, that Popery renounces Christ as the foundation of eternal life. It acknowledges him only as the ground-work of the corruptions and superstitions of the church. This rubbish is cast over him, and the deluded Papist mounts up to heaven on the heap of human merits which hides him from the view. Alas! alas! that a Protestant Clergyman should be so blinded by Satan as to unite himself to this ruinous system.

Section V.—Transubstantiation.

This is the most monstrous of all the absurdities to which Mr. Sibthorp has sworn assent. To believe this a man must first deny the evidence of his senses, and for the time being annihilate the reason with which God has endued him. Were we to reason from the simple fact of a man's believing such an extraordinary, irrational, and ridiculous dogma, the conclusion is inevitable, that there are no grounds for believing the testimony of such a one in any case of evidence. He that denies the evidence of sense in one case, may surely do it in another. His head must be confused, his reason impaired, and his judgment enfeebled. That transubstantiation, or the conversion of a wafer, or small cake, into the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Jesus Christ, is an *absolute impossibility*, a *monstrous absurdity*, and a *self-evident lie*, is fully demonstrated in my "Letters to O'Connell." It is considered there on the mere ground of reason, and the great absurdities and evils consequent upon the belief pointed out at large. I defy all the priests in the empire to overturn the arguments there advanced. There is one mode of argument still left open, and we will briefly pursue it on the present occasion. It is this, that transubstantiation is directly repugnant to the genius and meaning of the Scriptures. As Mr. Sibthorp professes to be a convert to this dogma, by reading the writings of Moses, let him point out any thing in the tabernacle

analagous to it. Or, if this would narrow his genius too much, let him have the range of the whole book of revelation. Here now is work for him to do; and if he pleases, he may call in the assistance of any Jesuit, however skilful in this controversy:—"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," and is fully sufficient "to make us wise unto salvation." Whatever doctrine is agreeable to that word must be true, and every doctrine opposed to it must be false. As man is here in a state of probation, so the Holy Ghost, in giving him the word of inspiration, accommodates himself to his state. Spiritual things are not only compared to spiritual—the Old Testament with the New—but there are a variety of figures of speech, similes and comparisons, parables and allegories, used in both, for the purpose of making known spiritual and invisible things to man, through the medium of those which are natural. If the doctrine of transubstantiation, therefore, be a revelation from heaven, it must be agreeable to the general tenor of the word of God; it must harmonize with the allegories, the spirituality, and the plain letter of the word; but if it can be shown to be in direct opposition to all these, then it is proved to be false, beyond the possibility of a doubt. Let us now attend for a little to these particulars, and we will soon discover it to be a doctrine of Antichrist.

1. It is contrary to the allegorical or figurative language of the Bible. It is necessary here to notice, particularly, that before our Lord instituted the sacrament of bread and wine, he eat the Passover with his disciples. The Paschal Lamb was eaten as a memorial of the destroying angel's passing over the houses of the Israelites, when he slew the first-born of Egypt, and was intended as a type of Christ. As the blood of the lamb was shed and sprinkled on the lintels and door-posts of their houses, so Christ's blood was poured out for us, and we must have the virtue of it applied to our hearts by faith, if we will escape eternal death. And as it was roasted with fire, and eaten with bitter herbs; so Christ suffered for our sins, and the efficacy of his passion must be received into penitent and believing hearts. In allusion to the Paschal Lamb, the Apostle saith, "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us." (1 Cor. v. 7.) Indeed all the ceremonial law centred in Christ: it is the shadow; he is the substance. When our Lord, therefore, said, this bread is my body, and this wine is my blood, his meaning simply amounts to this:—"The Jewish law is now terminated—the oblation and sacrifice are now abolished—a new dispensation is now opened—the paschal supper you have now eaten is the last that can be eaten with my Father's approbation; but as that lamb was my body hitherto, so this bread shall be my body for the time to come. And as its blood was my blood under the old dispensation, so this wine shall be my blood under the new. Do this, therefore, in remembrance of me; for as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show my death till I come."

These observations are fully sufficient to show every unprejudiced Romanist the true nature of the sacrament. It is a memorial, symbol, or sign, of the death and passion of Jesus. It never was

designed to be his real body; and I might assert, with equal argument to that of the Romish Priests, that every Paschal Lamb was transubstantiated into Christ's natural body, hundreds of years before he became incarnate. And when Moses sprinkled the blood of the oxen upon the people, saying, "Behold the blood of the covenant the Lord hath made with you" (Exod. xxiv. 8) I might as well infer, that he meant the blood of the *words* spoken by the Almighty on Mount Sinai, and of the *promise* made by the people to obey all he said, as for them to aver that Christ meant his own blood, when he said, this wine is my blood of the New Testament; whereas the blood mentioned by Moses, and the wine by Christ, were only figures of his sacrificial blood.

When Christ said, "this is my body, and this is my blood," the disciples well understood what he meant, for the same phraseology was common among the Jews. Pharaoh's chief butler, in his dream, saw a vine with three branches; the baker, in his, saw three baskets; when Joseph interprets, he says, "the three branches are three days," and "the three baskets are three days." Surely, there is just as much reason to argue from those phrases, that the three branches, and the three baskets, were three actual days, each twenty-four hours long, as for the priest to declare, that "the bread is the real, natural body of Christ." Again, Pharaoh, in his dream, sees seven fat kine, seven lean ones, seven full ears of corn, and seven empty ones; and when Joseph interprets, he says, "the seven kine are seven years," and "the seven ears of corn are seven years." All that Joseph meant was, that they represented seven years; and all that Christ meant, by a similar mode of speech, was, that it represented his body. But, in opposition to Scripture and common sense, the priest persists in imposing an absurdity on his followers, as great, as if I were to endeavour to make it appear, that kine and ears of corn were transubstantiated into years, each having 365 days; and when any remonstrate against the absurdity, I would silence all their objections, by assuming an air of infallibility, and promptly telling them—"There is no outward appearance of this change, for we only know it by faith. Hence, though what we see appears to be only kine and ears of corn, as before, you are bound to believe, that the years, months, weeks, days, hours, and seasons, with the sun, moon, planets, and stars, are all in these kine and ears of corn, after a miraculous manner; that they are under each of the two species of the kine and ears of corn, and under every particle of them, as under the whole, without the natural years being divided or multiplied among the kine and ears of corn, and without their ceasing to be in heaven, as before." Truly, we may be ashamed, when our countrymen are found capable of believing what is equally ridiculous. But, let us pursue this mode of illustrating the subject a little further.

The Prophet Daniel first tells Nebuchadnezzar his dream, chap. ii.—"Thou, O King! sawest and beheld a great image; it stood before thee, and the form thereof was terrible; his head *was* of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and thighs of brass,

his legs of iron, his feet of iron and part of clay; and then he goes on to interpret—"Thou (O King!) art this head of gold." This bread *is* flesh (saith the priest) for Christ declares, "this *is* my body." Nebuchadnezzar's body *is* gold (says I) because Daniel saith, "thou *art* this head of gold." Although the bread is flesh (saith the priest) yet it retains the appearance of bread; and although Nebuchadnezzar's body was gold, yet it retained the appearance of flesh. Christ's body can be in heaven and on the altar at the same instant (says the priest) and Nebuchadnezzar's body could be on the image, and off it, at the same time. Christ's body has the shape of a man in heaven; but, in the substance of the bread (says the priest) he has no particular shape; and Nebuchadnezzar's body was in the shape of a man, and of a golden head, at the same time. The argument is as forcible in the one case, as in the other; and on the same principles, because Christ says, the seven stars *are* the angels of the seven churches, and the seven candlesticks *are* the seven churches, we may argue that every star we see in the firmament is transubstantiated into an angel or bishop, and every candlestick into a church! The fact is, that "*this is*," and "*these are*," were not only common phrases among the Jews, for "*this represents*," or "*these represent*," but are even in common use among ourselves. This (map) *is* France, that *is* Spain, and here *is* England, says almost every one in the habit of teaching geography; and surely our language is not violated by this laconic language. Hagar and Sarah *are* the two covenants; the one from Mount Sinai, and the other from Mount Zion, says the Apostle. The field *is* the world—the sower *is* the son of man—the good seed *is* the children of the kingdom—the bad seed *is* the children of the wicked one—the harvest *is* the end of the world—and the reapers *are* the angels, saith Christ. But, who was ever so stupid as to imagine, that this language is not allegorical? So that it is abundantly evident, that when Christ says, "this *is* my body," he only means, "this bread represents my body;" and thus, transubstantiation is demonstratively proved to be contrary to the figures, and figurative language of the Scripture. But,

2. It is in direct opposition to the spirituality of it. The religion of Rome may be properly termed the *religion of sense;* although, in this case, the evidence of sense is denied by her followers. What ought to be understood spiritually, she endeavours with all her heart to carnalize; and thus affords her votaries a mechanical kind of devotion, which meets the outward sense, but reaches not the heart. God sent not his Son into the world, that we might literally eat his flesh and drink his blood, but that he might dwell in our hearts by faith. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth," said Christ, "the flesh profiteth nothing." This was his concluding sentence after he told his disciples, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." Every Jew had a great abhorrence of blood; and every man who heard him make the declaration understood him spiritually, or was brought to understand his declaration so, by the application now mentioned.

"Though we have known Christ after the flesh," says the Apostle, "yet now henceforth know we him no more." It was Christ dwelling in Paul the hope of glory, which constituted the essence of his religion, and not Christ entering literally into his stomach, where he could not abide. It must be an extraordinary kind of religion, indeed, which only affords Christ a place in the body for a little, at the same time Satan may be permitted to reign unto death in the soul. Now, granting to the Romanists, that they literally receive Christ's natural body under the species of bread, I would sincerely ask, what do they gain by the reception? Do not the priests keep back his blood; so that though they eat his flesh, they do not drink his blood, and hence are not partakers of life according to their own system. But, suppose they eat his flesh, and drink his blood, and receive him entire under each of the species, still it is better to be a Protestant, who hears the word of God, and keeps it, than a follower of the priesthood, who rejects that word, and breaks it. Let every Romanist attend to the following passage, recorded in Luke xi. 27, and then let him judge how far it will profit him to receive Christ's body as really and substantially as it was in the womb of the Virgin:—"And it came to pass, as he spake these things, a certain woman (shall we say she was a Romanist?) of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked. But he said, *Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it!*" According to Christ's own declaration we may certainly infer, that it is a greater privilege and happiness to know the will of God by hearing it, and to do his will, through faith in that word, than it was for the Virgin Mary to conceive and suckle the holy child. By rejecting his word and will, she might have lost her soul; but whosoever hears his word, and keeps it, in a penitent and believing heart, cannot fail of everlasting life, since God is faithful to his promise. From these observations we may justly conclude, that transubstantiation can answer no purpose of salvation; that it is no superior privilege, even were it true; and that it is directly opposed to the spiritual meaning of the holy word of God.

3. This dogma is completely at variance with the express letter of the word. The several accounts of the institution of the Lord's supper taken together, amount simply to this: that "Jesus took bread, blessed, brake, and gave it to his disciples, and said, Take eat, this is my body broken for you. Do this in remembrance of me. And in the same manner he took the cup, and said, drink ye all of it." Now, the question at issue is, whether it was *bread* which they eat, or the *real* and *substantial body* of our Lord. If bread, then transubstantiation is false, and the Papists have no sacrament. If our Lord's body, then the Evangelists and Paul are false witnesses, for they have testified the contrary. On this, we remark:—1. If the bread was his real body, then he must, at that time, have had two real bodies—one that *gave*, and another that *was given*. 2. If the wine was his real blood, containing his body,

blood, soul, and divinity, then it follows, that Christ's body was reduced to a liquid state—that he held it in his own hand—and that he actually drank himself, which is absurd, and naturally impossible. 3. Christ instituted this as a memorial of himself, but this it cannot be, if it be his real person, for there can be no memorial of any one who is present. 4. Christ blessed the bread, and no more; the priest annihilates it by his consecration, and a thing cannot be blessed which has ceased to exist. 5. Christ broke it; but the priest says, it must not be broken, but swallowed whole. 6. Christ gave the bread, and said, take eat; the priest gives his body, and bids his disciples swallow it, without eating. 7. Christ spoke in a known tongue; the priest in one that is unintelligible. 8. Christ gave the cup; the priest withholds it. 9. Christ did not sacrifice himself until the next day on the cross; the priest pretends to hold him up as a sacrifice at once. 10. Christ did not elevate the bread as an object of worship; the priest holds up the host, and causes the people to bow down to it. 11. Christ spoke nothing of the merit of saints; the priest, after kissing the altar, says, "We pray thee, Lord, through the *merits* of thy *saints*, whose *relics* are here, that thou wilt vouchsafe to pardon me all my sins." 12. Christ did not pray for the dead; the priest does. 13. Christ had no images present; the priest has them on the altar. Lastly, Christ instituted the sacrament, to show his death for the remission of sins; the priest will sing a private mass, in which he offers our Lord's body for the curing of a sick animal, for the prosperity of fishermen in the season, and for the liberation of souls from a purgatory, that has no existence, but in his money-making creed. Such is the amazing difference between the simple institution of this sacrament and the vile corruptions of Mr. Sibthorp's new church. She has made a profane mockery of this institution, and drawn millions of human beings into the idolatrous worship of a piece of bread.

In connexion with the dogma of transubstantiation, let us glance at a few of the Popish miracles recorded concerning it. In a book of Homilies upon the Festivals before the Reformation, we have a specimen of the instruction given to the laity. In one of these we are told, that a Jew went with a Christian to hear mass. When it was over, the Jew told him, "if he had eaten as much as he saw him eat, he would not be hungry in three days." The Christian said, "he had eat no sort of meat that day." He replied, "I saw thee eat a child which the priest held up at the altar." From this it is evident, that to convert the Jews, we have only to send them to mass.

Bellarmine relates the following story, which he extracted out of *Ribadeneira*, as a notable miracle. St. Anthony, and a certain heretic near Toulouse, were disputing concerning the eucharist. The heretic proposed to keep his mule fasting three days, that at the end St. Anthony should bring the host, and if the mule should leave his provender, and come and venerate it, he would then believe. These conditions being accepted, St. Anthony came, accompanied with a multitude of the faithful, and holding the con-

secrated wafer in his hand, thus addressed the mule:—"In virtue and name of thy Creator, whom I, though unworthily, hold in my hand, I require and command thee, O animal, that thou immediately approach, after thy manner, and show reverence to him, that heretical pravity may understand, that every creature is to be subject to his Creator, whom the priestly dignity daily handles at the altar." The effect was magical; the hungry mule left his provender, approached the host, bowed his head and his knee, adored his Maker, and confuted the heretic! This precious legend, however, is fully equalled by another related by Cessarius, *lib.* iv. cap. 99. He reports, that an old priest, of the parish of St. Colen, was carrying the holy sacrament to a sick person out of town. The hill was rough, the way narrow and miry, and meeting a number of asses laden with corn, and finding it impossible to pass them without being overturned, he said to them in all simplicity, "O asses, what do you mean? Why do you not consider whom I carry in my hands? Stand still, fall down and honour your Creator, for I command you in his name." O, wonderful obedience! those asses moved to the steep side of the hill, fell down upon their knees, and what is marvellous, not one of their loads was upset. This story was one of the many lies famous at Cologne. The mule and the asses, however, are far outdone by the story of the *black horse*, taken from the Book of Festivals already named. It is printed in black letter, and the reader has it here according to the old English fashion in point of spelling:—

"In Devonshyre besyde Exbridge, was a woman that lay sick, and was nye deed, and sent after a holy person about midnight, to have her ryghts. Than this man, in all haste he might, arose and went to the Church, and took Goddes Body in a box of Ivory, and put it into his Bosome, and went forth toward this woman. And as he wente thorough the Forest in a fayre mede that was his next waye, it happed that his box fell out of his bosome to the ground, and he wente forth and wyst it not, and came to this woman, and herde her Confession. And than he asked her yf she wolde be houseled, and she sayd, ye Syr. Than he put his hande into his bosome, and sought the box, and when he found it not, he was full sorry and sad, and sayd, Dame, I will go after Goddes Body and come agayne anon to you; and so he wente forth sore wepinge for his Sympleness. And so as he came to a wylowe tree, he made thereof a rodde and stryped himself naked and bette himself, so that the blode came down by his sydes, and said thus to himself:—O thou simple man, why hast thou lost thy Lord God, thy Maker, thy Fourmer and Creatour: and when he had thus bette himselfe, he did on his clothes and wen the forth; and than he was ware of a pyller of fire that lasted from erth to heven, and he was all astonyed thereof, yet he blessyed him and wente to it; and there lay the Sacrament fallen out of the boxe into the grasse, and the pyllar shone as bryght as the sunne, and it lasted from Goddes Body to Heven: and all the beests of the Forest were comen about Goddes Body and stode in compasse round about it, and all kneeled on four

knees, save one black Horse that kneeled but one knee. Than said he, yf thou be any beest that may speke, I charge thee, in Goddes name, here present in four me of Breed; tell me why thou knelest but on one knee. Than said he, I am a fende of hell, and will not knele, and I might, but I am made against my will, for it is wrytten, that every knelynge of heven and of erthe shall be to the Worship of the Lord God. Why art thou like a hors? And he sayd, to make the peeple to stele me: and at suche a towne was a man hanged and at such a Towne another. Than sayed the holy persone, I commande thee by Goddes fleshe and his blode, that thou go into Wyldernesse, and be there, as thou shalt never dysease crysten man more. And than he went his way, he might no longer abyde, and than this man went forthe to the woman and did the ryghtes, by the which she was saved and went to everlasting salvacyon. Lo the whiche he brynge us, our blessed Savyour Thesus."

These legends were invented to uphold transubstantiation, and the idol of the mass. They are a reflection, not upon religion, for it has nothing to do with them, but upon the intellect, and moral feeling of those who received them. They show the degraded state of man, when destitute of the divine word. They are the legitimate offspring of false dogmas, and the teachings of superstition. This is the kind of piety which Mr. Sibthorp found, and seems to admire, in the Church of Rome. He is quite enamoured with her external holiness, and forsaking the simplicity of truth in one point; his enthusiasm prepares him to follow the *ignis fatuus* of this false system into every mire of superstition.

Section VI.—Communion in one kind.

This is the sixth article in which Mr. S. has "departed from the faith." The Apostle, in 2 Thes. ii. 3, says, "Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come except there come a *falling away* first, and that Man of Sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped," &c. This passage relates to the succession of Popes. It can receive no other application. The opposition to God and Christ here spoken of is strikingly displayed in half communion. Mr. S. has sworn assent to this. Has he not, therefore, apostatized with the Man of Sin? The decree of the Council of Trent, which he has embraced, gives awful proof of this. Let us now quote it, and you will be the judges if there is not a direct exaltation above our Saviour Jesus Christ, who said to his disciples, "Drink ye all of this." When Mr. S. wrote so smoothly and piously about this church, he only exhibited her as she appeared to his own deluded imagination. It is our busines to look at her just as she is, and as she is held forth in the light of truth. The decrees of her councils form a dark contrast to the revelation of God. None is blacker or more striking than the following:—

"If any one shall say, that all faithful Christians ought, either from the precepts of God, or from the need of salvation, to receive the sacrament of the eucharist in both kinds, let him be accursed! And if any one shall say, that the Holy Catholic Church has not been induced by just causes to communicate it to the laity and the non-officiating clergy, in the species of bread only, or to have erred in that respect, let him be accursed."

The following arguments exhibit the Man of Sin in this departure, and depict the dreadful guilt and heresy of the Church of Rome:—

1. It is evident, that our Lord gave the cup to his disciples; for in addition to what St. Paul records, we read in Matt. xxvi. 27, that our Lord said expressly, "*Drink* ye *all* of *it:*" and St. Mark as expressly declares, chap. xiv. 23, "He *gave it* to *them;* and *they all drank* of *it.*" Our Lord commanded all his disciples to drink of it, and they all obeyed his command. There were *no officiating clergy* at the time; and hence, it follows, that as our Lord commanded them to receive in both kinds, that this very council has most wickedly and blasphemously cursed the very author of Christianity, as well as all that follow his example. Let Mr. S. deny this if he can.

2. The Apostle Paul evidently commanded the Corinthians, and of course the church in all ages, to receive in both kinds, because 1. He places before them the institution of the eucharist in *both kinds* by our Lord. 2. He says expressly, that he had "received of the Lord" the statement now made; and 3. He calls on every man to examine himself," and so let him *eat* of *that bread,* and *drink* of *that cup;*" and hence, it follows, that this infallible Council of Trent has actually cursed the blessed Apostle St. Paul, because he commanded the *laity* of the Church of Corinth, and of course the *laity* in all ages, to receive in both kinds. Let Mr. S. deny this if he can.

3. Our Lord's commission to his Apostles immediately before he ascended into glory, is recorded Matt. xxviii. 19, 20—"Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe *all things* whatsoever *I* have *commanded* you: and, lo, I am with you alway unto the end of the world." The Apostles did as Christ commanded; and hence, they taught the primitive church, that he said, in relation *both* to the *bread* and the *cup*, "Do this in remembrance of me;" and that he said *especially* concerning the cup, "*Drink* ye *all* of *it;*" and the primitive Christians went according to their directions; and hence, it follows again, that the Council of Trent cursed to everlasting misery, not only the primitive church, but the whole college of the Apostles. Luther, Calvin, and all Protestants, might, therefore, well content themselves under this sweeping curse of the Church of Rome.

4. In taking the cup from the laity, which has been the case since the establishment of transubstantiation, by the 4th Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215, under Innocent III., the Church of Rome,

instead of cursing others, has subjected herself to the heaviest woes and curses denounced in the word of God. "If any man shall *add* unto these things, God shall *add* unto him the plagues which are written in this book. Any if any man shall *take away* from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall *take away* his part out of the book of life." (Rev. xxii. 18, 19.) "*Cursed* is *every one* that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to *do* them." (Gal. iii. 10.) "But though *we*, or an *angel* from heaven, preach *any other Gospel* unto you than that which we have preached unto you, *let him be accursed.*" (Gal. i. 8.) Here then are counter-curses denounced—the curses of God, and those of the Romish Church. Which of them shall we Protestants dread? Is she herself not under the curse of Almighty God? Is she not opposing and exalting herself above God, even in her very curses? Does she not curse those whom God has blessed, and put herself under the ban of divine wrath in doing so? She has taken away from the word of God, and from the most simple institution of the eucharist. She has set her authority in direct opposition to Christ, and keeps back the wine in the sacrament, which he instituted as a type of his blood shed for the remission of sin. Her wickedness is a mark of her apostacy from Christ; but her religion and institutions are still a stronger proof against her.

5. It has been demonstrated already, that the bread is not changed into Christ's body, and hence it follows, that as the cup is kept back from the laity, not one of them has received the eucharist from 1215 up to this hour, in the Church of Rome. In the wide range of her empire, not one of the laity has, properly speaking, obeyed the command of our Lord, "Do this in remembrance of me." for 627 years. Even her officiating clergy cannot be said, in point of profession, to receive it. They take neither the bread nor the wine as a sign of his body and blood, but as the real body and blood itself; and hence, as they now have neither the *sign* nor the *substance*, the whole church is destitute of the true ordinance of the eucharist. It would seem, that the providence of God permitted her to fall into this pit of absurdity, that while she boasts of her infallibility, she might be laughed to scorn by all who know the truth. The very fact of her clergy receiving in both kinds, is a proof of her apostacy in keeping the cup from the laity, and an index which points even from her altars to Protestantism as the true and primitive religion!

6. The Council of Trent pronounces a heavy curse on "any one that shall say, the Holy Catholic Church has not been induced by *just causes* to communicate it to the laity and the non-officiating clergy in the species of bread only." These just causes are enumerated in the Trent Catechism, and amount to the following:—1. The *accidents* or *indignities* to which the chalice or blood of Christ might be subjected by administering in a crowded assembly. 2. The necessity of having it always in readiness for the sick; and if the wine remained long unused, it might become *vapid*. 3. There are many who cannot bear the *taste* or *smell* of *wine*. 4. In many

places wine is *scarce*, and to bring it from distant countries would incur very *heavy expense*. 5. The church wished to crush the heresy, which denied Christ to be contained *whole* and *entire* under *one species*. (See page 244, Donovan's translation.) Here are the just, cogent, and weighty reasons, assigned by the Church of Rome for communion in one kind—for altering the institutions of Christ—for denying the people their scriptural rights—for incurring the wrath of Almighty God. The body and blood of Christ, in a *liquid state*, was subject to accident and indignity—to be spilled or lost—it was liable to become *vapid*—to lose its *flavour* and *spirit*—in fact, to *evaporate*. Besides, the material of which it is made was scarce in the days of the Council of Trent, and very expensive; and as the bread could be got more conveniently, and at a cheaper rate, it was considered good enough for the *laity*, especially as several of them had such a natural antipathy to wine, that they could not bear its taste or its smell, even when changed into the *true*, *real*, and *substantial body* and *blood* of the Redeemer of the world! Such is the silly, absurd, and blasphemous reasoning of the Church of Rome, in opposition to the plainest declarations of the Gospel. As the person who has lost his way becomes the more confident that he is near the termination of his journey, the farther he departs from it; so the Church of Rome boasts more and more of her infallibility—her incapability of erring, the farther she travels from Christ and the institutions of the Gospel. She shuts out the light of the sun of righteousness, that her own torch may appear the brighter, and would fain make the world believe that her flickering taper is the most brilliant luminary of heaven. Nay, her very darkness is light, her errors truth, her sin is holiness, and her absurdities the very essence of right reason!

7. We cannot now fail to observe her infidelity in relation to the Scriptures: in fact, she only pretends to believe them. She sets herself not only above, but in opposition to the word of Christ. This she could never do if she believed that word. She corrupts every institution and doctrine of the Redeemer, and then, forsooth! tries to support her own authority and wicked novelties by prostituting his word, or advancing portions detached from the context, in a sense never intended by the Spirit of inspiration. Let us now, in conclusion, glance at her note in favour of half-communion and the real presence. In 1 Cor. xi. 27, "Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," she has the following note:—"Here the Protestant Testament is corrupted, by putting *and drink* (contrary to the original) instead of *or drink* (*he pine.*") On this I observe:—1. That as the real presence is false, the Apostle can have no illusion to it here. 2. That as our Lord administered in both kinds, St. Paul cannot contradict him. 3. That he does not contradict him, inasmuch as he uses (*Kai*) and five times in the connection of this passage. 4. That our translators were justified by the context in translating *and* instead of *or*. 5. That if the Church of Rome could demonstrate the correctness of

her translation, it only makes against her, because it proves that those who eat the bread, or drank the cup, without special faith in the sufferings and blood-shedding of Christ, as the only atonement for the sins of mankind, are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. 6. If the Rhemish translation were the true one, the Apostle should have said, "Whosoever shall eat this bread, *or* drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body *or* blood of the Lord; but as he uses *(Kai) and*, in the latter clause, in speaking of the guilt, so it would have been absurd in our translators to have translated *(he pine) or drink*, instead of *and drink*. The criticism, therefore, of the Rhemish notes is a false one. 7. The true meaning of the passage is simply this: the Apostle reproves the Corinthians, and shows them the guilt and danger of eating the bread as a common meal, not discerning the Lord's body; or drinking the cup even to drunkenness (ver. 21) not discerning the Lord's blood; and hence, in relation to half-communion, the Church of Rome has not even a particle of the Divine word on which to rest her pretensions. Every man who desires to save his soul in obedience to the command of Christ, should insist on having the cup from his priest, as well as the bread; or flee from a communion that cannot have the sanction of God. The real presence is undoubtedly false, and hence the administration of the bread without the cup, is not the sacrament of the eucharist.

It is impossible to restrain indignation at the insidious attempts of the Puseyites, to bring back the people of England to these dreadful falsehoods. Mr. S. has acted an honest part in proclaiming himself a convert to the corruptions of Rome; but these conceal with all subtilty the abominations of Popery under a mask of Protestantism, and feigned zeal for the church, whose very articles they would obliterate or explain away.

Section VII.—Purgatory.

The seventh article in the creed of Pius IV. is purgatory. To the truth of its existence, and the benefits derived from it, Mr. S. has also solemnly sworn. The 22nd article of the Church of England declares it to be "a fond thing, vainly invented and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture." The Church of Rome, however, says it, and Mr. S. believes it. The Council of Trent establishes it as an article of faith on pain of damnation. It is derived from the Latin verb, *purgo*, to cleanse, purge, refine, or separate the filth, dross, or impurities of any thing. Bellarmine asserts it to be "a certain place, in which, as in a prison after this life, those souls are purged, which, in this life, were not fully cleansed—that so being at length purified, they may be able to enter into heaven, into which nothing unclean can enter." The *place* of it is left undefined; hence some think the spirit wanders in doleful places; others, that it is confined in the grave. A few have fancied it to be confined in the valley of Jehosaphat; many have doomed it to some gloomy region of the air; thousands imagine it to be in the bowels of the

earth; but the most popular notion, at least in Ireland, where the people have the best right to know, being so well instructed by the Maynooth priests, places it in a middle region between heaven and hell. Hence—

When the Almighty built his high abode,
He named it *heaven*—the dwelling place of God:
And when the rebel angels fought and fell,
He doom'd them to a certain place called *hell.*
Both are recorded in the sacred story,
But not one word concerning *purgatory*—
And yet our pious priests, without a doubt,
Have found this uncreated *Limbus* out!
It stands, they say—and they alone can tell—
Just half way on the plain 'tween heaven and hell.
To them St. Peter gave the pond'rous keys,
And bade them claim and take the jailor's fees;
And singe, or save; or send to hell, or heaven,
According as the gold is kept or given.
Who then can doubt that priestly power could make
A fiery prison near the burning lake?
For he whose power can form the Lord of glory,
Could now create *another* purgatory.

The *persons* liable to be committed to this jail form another dispute in this infallible church. Some say all *devils*, and all *men*, shall in course of time be purified in its flames. Others assert it is only for *men*—others only for *Christian* men, whether heretics or not. The heretics, not believing Popery, will have a bad chance without the mass of course! Some aver, that *Catholics* alone shall have the benefit; and others deny it to them, unless they persevere steadfastly to the end in a course of duty—or, being very wicked, if they have been given to *alms-deeds.* Thus one absurdity leads to another. The *duration* of its torments is equally undecided. One thinks it cannot last more than ten years; others extend it till the period of the resurrection; and some even beyond that. There is no great *certainty* either concerning the *pains* to be endured. Bellarmine, who descants on all the former points, tells us on this, that the pain consists in that of sense produced by fire, and also in being deprived of the beatific vision of God. Pope Gregory the Great, one of the first discoverers of this unknown region, says, "that some are purged by fire, and some by baths." The theory of fire, however, is that which is generally held in Ireland, and hence some of the peasantry are buried with boots on them, with a good thick sole to save their feet on the fiery pavement! A curious method to be sure of purifying a man's soul, even were it lodged in the feet! That the pains are extreme, is evident, from one of their legends, advanced in a sermon on the subject:—"Once upon a time, a good fellow, who had lain there for thirty years, having a fair choice made him, whether he would lie there one day longer, or return to the earth and be bound for one hundred years together, to walk upon sharp iron-nails, which should pierce his feet, and to eat nothing but bread baked on the embers, and to drink nothing

but vinegar mingled with gall, and to wear nothing but that which was made of camels' hair, and to lie always on the cold earth, with a stone under his head, instead of a pillow, made choice to abide all this rather than continue one day longer in purgatory."

To recite these dotages is to refute them. It must be exceedingly absurd to impose, as an article of faith, on the common people, a *mere figment*, concerning which their most profound Doctors are not agreed. Infallibility has neither decided one thing nor another concerning it. Let the following remarks now be well weighed, and every one of you may judge of the folly and wickedness of this invention :—

1. Its fire burns up the other dogmas, and destroys belief in various practices of the Church of Rome. If the soul must pass into the fire of purgatory, when it departs this life, what becomes of penances, confessions, and the priest's absolution? These are not worth a straw. What virtue is there in the mass, when it cannot keep a man out? What is the benefit of extreme unction? If confessions, penances, pilgrimages, holy water, absolutions, masses, and extreme unction, have any virtue, then purgatory is "a vain thing fondly invented;" and if the story of purgatory be correct, it follows of course, that there is little or no virtue in these things. He who pays for the former should advance nothing for the latter. The greatest sinner, of course, requires the greatest number of masses, when he enters that gloomy region, and hence the Pope being prayed for every where at his decease, the fact proves him to be the Man of Sin.

2. I cannot understand how material fire could operate on an immaterial spirit. If Mr. S. proves with Priestly, that a man's soul is made of the same stuff as a smith's anvil, there will then be some degree of sense and philosophy in the doctrine of purgatory. Could the material fire of that prison operate on mere ideas? Could it inspire faith, love, peace, joy? Could it convert the soul from nature to grace, and from the power of sin and Satan to the service of the living God? Could it purge away the Pope's pride, or destroy a priest's covetousness? If the devil be in a man's soul, when he enters purgatory, could the fire of that place burn him out, when that of hell fails to effect the purpose? If God has any thing to say to purgatory—if he watches over the souls that enter there, does he not know when they are fully purified? and would he not, on the principles of goodness and justice, liberate them, whether the masses be said or not, and whether the money be paid or not? How does the priest know exactly when the soul is emancipated? May he not say a mass too much, and thus present the sacrifice of Christ in vain? If a priest be paid 50s. for saying fifty masses in behalf of a departed soul, would he not act the rogue if he neglected one of the fifty? As the mass consists in presenting to God the real, true, and substantial body of Christ, for the liberation of this soul from purgatory, how does the priest know but the Divine Being accepts of the first, and dismisses the poor prisoner? Would God honour his Son's sacrifice by demanding a repetition?

If the first be sufficient, are not the remaining forty-nine a solemn mockery of God? Is not this selling the Saviour for money as Judas did? If the priest withholds the number, he acts dishonestly, because he is paid for saying them; if he fulfils his contract, he mocks God. Is not Popery a system of delusion, infidelity, and trickery, practised in the most solemn things, either in time or in eternity?

3. The Apostle, in 2 Cor. iv. 18, asserts, that "the things which are *unseen* are *eternal;*" purgatory, and the sufferings of the souls there, are *unseen;* therefore they are eternal. What difference is there then between purgatory and hell? Masses on this principle are of no use, unless to make gain. Again, the Apostle, in 2 Cor. iv. 10, declares, that "we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." The priest's purgatory contradicts the Apostle; for it represents some as receiving glory independently of the things done in the body. Again, a man either dies in the Lord, or not. If he does not die in the Lord, he can never enter heaven; if he dies in the Lord, the declaration of the Spirit is (Rev. xiv. 13) "that he rests from his labours;" not so, says the priest, he only enters on his greatest sufferings. Whether shall we believe the Spirit of God, or the Church of Rome?

4. The doctrine of purgatory is derogatory to the virtue of Christ's blood. The atonement was "finished" upon the cross. In him justice was completely satisfied. Hence the Apostle John says, "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." Not so, says the Church of Rome, it does not cleanse from venial sin. "Unto him that loved us," saith the same Apostle, "and washed us from *our sins, in his own blood*, be glory and dominion for ever and ever." It is false, says the Church of Rome, for we are only purified finally by the fire of purgatory; and hence the flames, and the masses, and the priests, are to receive the praise, or the survivor of the deceased, who kindly discharges the sums demanded for the masses. What a virtue is in money! Money coming into the world, money when in it, money going out of it, and money when gone! Again, in Rev. vii. 13, we read, "What are these arrayed in white robes? and whence came they?" These are they who belong to the holy, infallible, Roman Catholic Church, whose robes were purified by the flames of purgatory, and liberated by masses. No; but "these are they that came out of great tribulation, *having washed their robes* and *made them white in the blood* of *the Lamb*." Such is the testimony of an elder before the throne, and yet he is contradicted by the Church of Rome. Thus, the virtue of Christ's most precious blood is neutralised and despised by this most abominable figment.

5. The capital objection to purgatory, and in fact to the entire system of Popish doctrines and practices, is, that they are directly repugnant to the grand leading doctrine of the Gospel—*justification* by *faith* in *the merits* of *Christ alone*. No man that ever lived can

reconcile the doctrine of purgatory with that of faith. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; and he that believeth not, shall be damned. A man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." These Scriptures demonstrate that *faith is the only instrument* of *pardon* and *salvation.* The question now is, can faith be exercised in purgatory, or in the invisible state? I answer, it *cannot.* Faith relates to the things that are unseen; it springs from testimony; but the very fact of a spirit passing from this world to the unseen state, prevents the possibility of testimony. Mr. S. requires no proof that the sun shines when he is looking at him. The actual presence of an object gives knowledge. No man can be justified by *knowledge*, but by *faith;* and hence a man dying in unbelief, being removed to a region, where the presence of the objects force knowledge irresistibly on the mind, he cannot receive testimony concerning those things that are now present with him; and, therefore, must be lost for ever. A departed spirit is not in the region of testimony, and hence, if he be in sin of any kind, he can never believe, and, of course, can never either be justified or saved. In this world alone it is possible for us to believe. The doctrine of purgatory is directly repugnant to this doctrine; it shuts out the light of faith, binds men in unbelief, and, by inspiring a false confidence, cheats the soul of salvation in the eternal world.

6. This figment dishonours the Holy Trinity, and the whole scheme of redemption. God declares, that he blots out our sins as a cloud—that he casts them into the depth of the sea—and that he will remember them no more; but the doctrine of purgatory holds him forth as pardoning with reservation, as taking two payments for the one debt—one from Christ, and another from the sinner hereafter, and thus reflects on his goodness and veracity. Christ, as Mediator, offered himself once to God, made a complete atonement, pleads the virtue of it at the right hand of God, and obtains pardon for every one who believes with the heart unto righteousness; but this "fond thing vainly invented" detracts from the virtue of his blood, renders his intercession vain, and stamps all his sufferings and acts with inefficiency. The Holy Ghost is spoken of in the Divine word as the Spirit of judgment and of burning, because it purifies the soul—as living water, because it cleanses from all sin—and as the breath of Jehovah, because it inspires with spiritual life, and destroys the death of sin in the soul; but the fire of purgatory represents his nature, perfections, and offices, in relation to man, as utterly vain and worthless. Its false light lures millions from the light of truth, directs them into a wrong path, and renders it impossible for them to retrace their steps, when they find, to their eternal loss, that they have been deceived. Such is the dreadful tendency and dishonouring character of this lying dogma. Let Mr. S. try and wipe the dishonour away.

Section VIII.—Invocation of Saints.

Hitherto we have been occupied in canvassing the dogmas which Mr. Sibthorp has received as articles of faith; we now come to gaze on some of the fruits of this upas tree, and try whether they be in accordance with the unholy stem which produces them. One of the most luxurious crops is found in the worship of saints, and the relics alluded to in this article of the creed of Pius IV. In the 25th session of the Council of Trent we find the following decree on this subject:—"The sacred council commands all bishops, and others sustaining the function and the care of teaching—that they *diligently* shall instruct the faithful in the first place, respecting the *intercession* and *invocation* of *saints*, the *honour* of *relics*, and the *legitimate* use of *images*, teaching them that the saints reigning with Christ do offer their prayers to God for man—that it is *good* and *useful*, *supplicantly* to *invoke* them;" and then it tells us, we are "to fly for refuge to their prayers, *aid*, and *assistance*," and that it is "impious in thought to deny this," or to assert "that it is foolish, either with the *voice* or *mind*, to supplicate the saints reigning in heaven."

The priests are faithful to their obligations in teaching their followers this branch of worship. In proof of this we need not search obscure authors among them; but simply attend to the popular worship of the day, and the Roman *Breviary* corrected and issued by the decree of the Council of Trent. In this the Virgin Mary is called, "The Mother of God—Seat of Wisdom—Gate of Heaven—Mother of Divine Grace—Refuge of Sinners—Ark of the Covenant—Comfort of the Afflicted—the Help of Christians—and the *Queen of Heaven*, of Angels, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, and of all the Virgins and Saints." Hence in the Litany of the Virgin, we read, "We fly to your patronage, O sacred Mother of God, despise not our prayers in our necessities, but deliver us from all danger, O ever glorious and blessed Virgin." She is entreated to "loose the bonds of the guilty, give light to the blind, drive away our evils, obtain good things for us, and show herself to be a *Mother;* that is, as the Mass Book of Paris, 1634, interprets it, "In *right* of a *Mother to command her Son.*" In the office of the visitation of the sick, the priest, laying his right hand on the sick person's head, prays, "*That Jesus the Son of Mary, and Saviour of the world, would* (not for the sake of his own merits, but) *for the merits and intercession of his holy Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, and all saints, be merciful unto him.*" In the office of the sacrament of penance there is this remarkable prayer, "*The passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the merits of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of all saints, and whatsoever evil thou hast suffered, be to thee for the remission of sins, the increase of grace, and the reward of eternal life.*" Now, let the reader judge if God's glory is not given away to the creature, and the merits of Jesus Christ placed on the *same level* with the

merits of saints! This is creature worship with a witness! On this worship of saints and angels, I make the following remarks:—

1. Let the reader now note the following facts and circumstances connected with the invocation of saints:—1. They do it with all the rites and solemnities of a religious worship. 2. They do it in sacred offices in their chapels. 3. They do it upon their knees, with their heads uncovered. 4. They do it with their hands and eyes lifted up. 5. They do it to beings whom they have never seen. 6. They pray to them for such blessings as God alone can give—mercy, deliverance, and assistance, remission of sins, light, liberty, grace, and eternal life. 7. They confess their sins to them; and 8. They pray mentally to them in accordance with the directions given by the Council of Trent; and we may add also, that they make vows to them, and praise them; as for instance, in the benediction, the Virgin Mary, or some saint, is associated with the Holy Trinity. Now, if Mr. S., or any other priest, can point out any worship given to Almighty God, in the Church of Rome, of a more extensive, exalted, and formal character than this, I will be obliged to him. I know he cannot, and hence it follows:—

2. That the WORSHIP of the CREATURE being EQUAL in THAT CHURCH to the WORSHIP of the CREATOR; that God is either brought down to their level, and thereby debased and denied, or else they are exalted into the dignity and character of God; and hence, let the one or other position be embraced, it stamps the worship in the Church of Rome with the same character as the idolatry condemned in the Scriptures. What was the idolatry condemned in 2 Kings, chap. xvii., commencing at the 32d verse—"So they feared the Lord, and made unto themselves of the lowest of their priests of the high places (as are now made in the Irish priesthood) which sacrificed for them in the houses of the high places. They feared the Lord (as the Romanists do) and served their own Gods (as they do the saints) after the manner of the nations." This service of angels and saints is that which St. Paul condemns in the strongest manner in Col. ii. 18. "Let no man beguile you," whether Pope, Council, Bishop, or Priest, "of your reward in a voluntary humility, and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and not holding (Christ) the head," &c. Here the practice is directly forbidden in as plain terms as even the Spirit of God ever used in relation to any evil. It is declared expressly, that those who act in this manner do not hold the head, and hence the Apostle Paul has completely *un*churched the priests and angel worshippers in the Church of Rome.

3. The worship demanded by Satan in the following words, is of this very character:—"All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship *me*." Here he appears as an angel of light. He acknowledges the being of God—he quotes Scripture—he does not deny, but confesses the true religion; but he would mix it up with false principles and practices. This has been his chief mode of proceeding from the very beginning. He even in-

spired the Gentiles not to deny the true God altogether, but to worship him in a false manner, by associating idols, heroes, and departed spirits with him in worship. Our Lord's reply to this deceiver cuts up the worship of the Church of Rome, both root and branch—"Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and *him only shalt thou serve.*" Who can reconcile this with the worship of saints and angels? The devil himself fled from before the face of this Scripture (Matt. iv. 11) and surely none of the priests will have the hardihood to attempt a return to the contest!

4. This practice of the Church of Rome is incompatible with the following Scriptures also:—"Call on me in the time of trouble; I will deliver thee." "Whatsoever ye will ask in my name, I will do it," saith Jesus. "Neither is there salvation in *any other*," saith St. Peter; and hence the Church of Rome is wrong in directing her people to seek it from a saint. "Their Redeemer is strong, the Lord of Hosts is his name, and he will thoroughly plead their cause," saith Jeremiah. "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus," saith St. Paul. Now, as Jeremiah tells us, that he will thoroughly or effectually plead our cause, and St. Paul, that he is the one Mediator, it necessarily follows, that the Church of Rome, in repairing to others, despises the commands and invitations of the Lord, and, by her councils and practices, detracts from the mediation of Jesus Christ. It is the same as to say, "that his advocacy is not sufficient—that his merit is defective—that there is salvation and deliverance in others;" or, to use the language of one of her advocates, "That the Mother's milk is equally to be esteemed with the Son's blood."

5. This practice is directly contrary to Scripture example. Peter would receive no worship from Cornelius. Paul and Barnabas would not permit the priest of Jupiter to sacrifice unto them at Lystra. (Acts xiv.) "They rent their clothes, and ran in among the people, crying out, and saying, Sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you, that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God," &c. Why did St. Paul not say to them, Wait till we are dead and canonized, and then you may worship us, and offer any sacrifice you please? Because he knew that no saint in heaven would permit or countenance idolatry; and hence, when St. John, in the visions of God, fell at the feet of the angel to worship him, no doubt thinking he was Christ, he said unto him, "See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the Prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God." The Council of Trent, therefore, in commanding this kind of worship, exalted itself above God, openly contradicted the letter of Scripture, and set its examples at defiance; and the priests, in this point, have taken a solemn oath to teach "diligently," in opposition to the Scriptures. The men, therefore, among them who burn the Bible, are among the most conscientious!

6. This practice of invoking saints is fraught with numerous and weighty evils. It is contrary to the command of God—divides his

glory with the creature—leads the heart away from Christ, the true and only Mediator—attributes two of the incommunicable attributes of God, Omnipresence and Omniscience, to the creature—hardens the heart—deceives the soul—cultivates superstition—and subjects all who are guilty of it, to all the woes denounced against idolatry in the word of God. It is incapable of any rational or Scriptural proof, and subjects its advocates to the contempt and sneer of the soundest reason. How could a saint hear one, two, or ten million of persons pray at the same time, and that in various and opposite parts of the globe? O, says Father Hayes, in his sermons, a saint moves with such velocity from one place to another, that he, or she, could attend to all. A very good argument, indeed! for if the saint moves so quickly from one to another, there is *no time* allotted to *any one;* and hence, *none can be heard.* "But God tells the saint," says another, "and then the saint prays." Suppose he does this for fifty million, does it not follow, that by the time the saint may be informed of each, and present his prayers, the majority of them might be dead, and sent to misery? Does not this demean God? and represent him as dissatisfied with the merit and intercession of his only begotten Son, "in whom," he declares, "he is well pleased?" If Christ knows and hears all prayer, is not this enough, without the prayers of saints? It is humiliating to reason to be constrained to stoop to such absurdities, by way even of a reply. Having now done with the saints, I am prepared to collect a few of their

RELICS.

"And the merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn over her; for *no man* buyeth their merchandize any more."—Rev. xviii. 11.

And who are the merchants here alluded to by St. John, that weep and mourn over fallen Babylon? The *priests* or *spiritual pedlars* of the Church of Rome—the *mitred merchants* and *apostolic mart-brokers,* who have dealt at large in peter-pence, first-fruits, dispensations, indulgences, pardons, agnus dei's, rosaries, albs, stoles, oils, cream, salt, holy-water, wax, frankincense, crosses, candlesticks, bells, jubilees, pilgrimages, crusades, carnivals, canonizations, shrines, privileged altars, auricular confessions, purgatories, masses, prayers for the dead, requiems, placebos, dirges, lamps, processions, baptism of bells, penances, works of supererogation, pictures, images, and *relics.* It is natural for them thus to weep, and mourn. There are few persons destitute of concern, when trade declines, and property departs out of their hands. Let not the Protestant reader, therefore, be astonished, that *all true* priests should grieve at the decline of trade, in this trumpery, or that they should detest the very names of Wickliffe, Luther, Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Calvin, Knox, and the first Reformers, who, by introducing the Scriptures among the laity, first put an end to the merchandize of Rome, throughout half of the western empire, and laid the foundation for the final overthrow of a system of super-

stition and monkish ignorance. The tears and lamentations of such are but the fulfilment of prophecy; let us not, therefore, wonder at their soreness, their envy, or unhallowed ill-will against every thing Protestant, and especially against the Bible. The loss of trade and revenue explains the whole. The show and consumption even of relics, are now merely matter of history, with the exception of a few, that are kept in a box, beneath the altar, when the priest, after kissing it, says, "We pray thee, Lord, through the merits of thy saints, whose *relics* are here, that thou wilt vouchsafe to pardon me all my sins."

From this it seems, that in every altar there must be a few as a token of the saints' merits, and a pledge of pardon to the priest himself. But what is the number now compared with the former times? and what is the value of the relics of a poor country, such as Ireland, when put in competition with those upon the Continent? In Rome, Venice, Prague, Cologne, &c., the Popish Museums contain a great variety. Let us enumerate a few of those that are still preserved. At Rome they exhibit the *stone* on which Abraham bound Isaac—*one* on which our Saviour stood in the Temple—the *pillar* to which he was bound—the *lance* that pierced his side—a *thorn* of the crown of thorns—the *table* on which he eat the paschal lamb—the *crib*, or *manger*, in which he was first laid—a *picture* of him begun by St. Luke, and finished by an angel—the *smock* of St. Prisca, 1,600 years old—the *head* of the woman of Samaria—the *arm* of St. Anne, mother of the blessed Virgin—and the *chair* of St. Paul. In Prague, they show the *head* and *arm* of Longinus, though his body is *entire* at Rome! The *arm* and *part* of the body of Lazarus—*two pieces* of two girdles of the blessed Virgin—a *part* of St. Mark's body—a *piece* of the coat of St. John the Evangelist—a *part* of St. Peter's staff—another of St. Paul's—a *finger* of St. Anne—a *portion* of the Virgin Mary's veil—the *head* of St. Luke—(I forgot to mention, that he has *another* at *Rome*)—the *head* and *finger* of St. Stephen. At Venice, they exhibit some of our Saviour's *blood*—a *finger* of Mary Magdalene—*part* of John the Baptist's skull—a *tooth* of St. Mark—*one* of his *fingers*—his *ring* with a stone in it—a *piece* of the Baptist's habit—some of the blessed Virgin's *hair*—the *sword* of St. Peter—*one* of the stones thrown at St. Stephen—and the *breath* of St. Joseph, which an *Angel* enclosed in a *vessel*, as he was cleaving wood. It is marvellous they have not preserved Peter's shadow in some kind of camera obscura: it would be a great rarity!

In relation to such objects of veneration, the *infallible* Council of Trent observes as follow:—"The holy bodies of the holy martyrs, &c., are to be *venerated* by the faithful; through which many benefits are to be afforded by God to man; so that those who affirm, that veneration and honour are not due to the relics of the saints, or that they, and other holy monuments, are uselessly honoured by the faithful, and that for the sake of attaining *their*

aid, the memories of the saints are in vain celebrated, are to be *utterly damned*, as formerly the church damned, and even now damns them."

This is a very hard sentence to be sure, but before we submit to it, it may not be amiss to make a few remarks, and inquire into its justice and sanctity. We will then see whether this cursing council was more likely to damn itself or others.

1. I should first wish to know how far the *veneration* or *honour* of relics is to extend? If a man worships them, he becomes an idolator, and is, according to the Scriptures, to have his portion in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone. (Rev. xxi. 8.) If he is not to worship them, I ask then how far is the *honour* to extend? Is not this a *cruel*, though *infallible* council, to damn a man for not doing a duty which they left undefined? I wish to know again, what benefit a person is to derive from them? They are said to be the medium of "many benefits." What are they? The council does not tell this, and yet would damn a man for not honouring them! This is something like madness. This, I suppose, is a mark of the true church, that she damns men when she gets into a fit of phrenzy.

2. The *body* of Longinus is *entire* at *Rome*, and an additional *head* and *arm*, &c., at Prague; and, also, St. Luke has a head in each place. I am now in Rome, and cannot believe that the head and arm of Longinus are the true ones, and yet the council damns me for not giving them veneration! Again, I am in Prague, and I am led from certain evidence to conclude, that St. Luke's head in Rome is an imposture, and yet this infallible council damns me for not venerating St. Luke's head in Rome. How shall we reconcile this? Why, that St. Luke, like the true, holy, orthodox, and infallible church had two heads, and yet was not a monster! Now, I could no more believe this, than I could believe that two different priests made each a body of Christ of a little bread, and yet that he had only one body. It would seem that this right of private judgment, and the senses God has given us, are very annoying to the infallibility of the Church of Rome! She may expect some contradictions while they are in the world.

3. I should wish to know, also, whether any of the heads attributed to St. Luke be his true identical head? How do they prove that the Virgin Mary wore a veil? If so, is that the very one? How do they know that that is the very stone which was thrown at St. Stephen? But, especially, I must be certain, that the *breath* of St. Joseph enclosed in that vessel is his real breath. Can it be proved that it never escaped, and that a priest, or some asthmatic friar, did not supply the vessel with his own? Was the vessel sealed by the angel? Was it sealed hermetically? To whom did he give the vessel? Can the church prove that no body ever opened it? Before the council damns me in the usual style, in which the church damns, is there any great harm in asking these questions? F. Mabillon, a Benedictine, justly complains "that

the altars were loaded with suspected relics; numerous spurious ones being offered every where to the piety and devotion of the faithful. Bones, too, are often consecrated, which so far from belonging to saints, probably do not belong to Christians." In the ninth century, relic-hunting attained to its greatest extent. Many with this view travelled in the eastern provinces, and by the craft, knavery, and dexterity of the inhabitants, were furnished with rich spoils for the purpose of calming troubled consciences, and driving away all sorts of calamities. Considerable sums were paid for the bones of Pagans, and even for some that were not human; and thus the church became furnished with several of those now mentioned, and hundreds of these that afterwards were the source of great gain to the clergy.

4. Being on this subject of relics, we must notice one whose worship is defined, and concerning which Pope John XXII. annexed an indulgence of ten thousand days for each prayer; and, of course, the prayer repeated three times a day, for one year, gives an indulgence of ten million, 950 thousand days. "Hail, holy face of our Redeemer! printed upon a cloth white as snow, purge us from all spot of vice, and join us to the company of the blessed. Bring us to our country, O happy figure! there to see the pure face of Christ." Now, to what is this prayer offered? To a *handkerchief* named the *Veronica!* It is supposed to have touched the body of our Lord, and has an altar consecrated to it in the Church of St. Peter in Rome, called the altar of the *holy* handkerchief! It is there worshipped at the fountain head of Popery, with the worship of *Latria*—that is, with the highest kind of worship which is due to God alone. Unfortunately, however, there was another at Jerusalem, and one at Alcantra in Spain. Each of them was worshipped with the same kind of worship, and wrought the same miracles. Hence a dispute arose about the original. This was settled by a subtle Jesuit of the name of Gretser, who discovered that it had three foldings; on each of which our Saviour imprinted a distinct image, and hence they were all originals! Now, the worship paid to this relic was either idolatry, or it was not. Is it not expressly contradicted by the law of God? which saith, "Thou shalt not make unto thyself the likeness of any thing in heaven above, or in the earth beneath; thou shalt not bow down to it, nor worship it." This printed image is prayed to, and requested to do what Christ alone can perform; and if this be not idolatry, we have no proof of any thing. The Council of Trent makes it binding on the members of the Church of Rome to *venerate* and *honour* relics, and here, in relation to the highest and best one ever found in that church, we find this honour terminating in supreme worship in three different places, while the only justification of the practice is found in the subtle invention of a Jesuit.

Section IX.—Image Worship.

We have now arrived at the 9th article of Mr. Sibthorp's new creed. In the 5th, he duly swore that the host should be worshipped; in the 8th, that the saints should be honoured and invocated; and in this, he swears, with all possible emphasis, that images are to receive due honour and veneration. He says, "*I most firmly* assert, that the images of Christ, of the Mother of God, ever Virgin, and also of other saints, may be had and retained; and that due honour and veneration is to be given to them." Is not this a complete departure from the faith? Mr. Sibthorp, in the course of his studies, five years ago, was, according to his own showing, led to embrace this creed in all its absurdities, by reading the writings of Moses. It is reasonable to conclude, that, on that occasion, he read the decalogue as well as the precepts relating to rites and ceremonies. How did the second commandment happen to escape his notice? Did the glories of the Church of Rome, like another new Jerusalem, so dazzle his eyes, that he could not see this command? If so, we must now bring it up before him; and if Moses does not re-convert his Reverence, he will at least confound him. Are the writings of Moses infallible? Then the infallible and idolatrous Church of Rome stands condemned in the twentieth chaper of Exodus. The second commandment stands out against her in bold relief.

"Thou shalt not make unto thyself any graven image, or any likeness of *any thing* that *is* in heaven above, or that *is* in the earth beneath, or that *is* in the waters under the earth: thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth *generation* of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments."

These words are found in every manuscript of the Hebrew Pentateuch that has ever yet been discovered. They are in all the ancient versions—the Samaritan, Chaldee, Syriac, Septuagint, Vulgate, Coptic, and Arabic. There is not one word wanting of the whole verse in the many hundreds of manuscripts collected by Kennicott and De Rossi, two of the greatest Biblical critics. They are also found in every Protestant translation, and even in the Douay itself; but, it *is a fact not to be disputed*, that they are excluded from the altars and catechisms of the Church of Rome. Wherever the Decalogue is exhibited to the laity, these words, which, for convenience, we call the *second* commandment, are left out; and what is termed the *tenth*, divided into two, *to make up* the number. Should not this very fact, universally known, awaken suspicion in the breast of every sincere, intelligent, and inquiring Roman Catholic, who, on finding out one infallible imposition, ought to suspect, and so examine the whole? The greatest vengeance is denounced against any man, or number of men, who either add to, or subtract from, the law of God, or the Gospel of Jesus

Christ; but how can we account for such an impudent and desperate proceeding on the part of these infallibles? In no other way than that adopted by the Jesuits—that a Pope and Council are superior to the Scriptures, and can alter them at pleasure! Vasques asserts, that "the Apostles' power to make laws was not greater than the power of the Church and of the Pope." Salmeron declares, "it is no wonder if the Scripture be subject to the church, which hath the Spirit." Again he says, "We are no way bound to imitate Christ in all things, except good manners;" and, also, that "*the church's authority* is *more ancient*, and *more worthy, than the authority* of *the Scriptures*." John Almain, a Sorbonnist, declares, that "*the Pope* may *dispense* in *things that* are *forbidden* by *God's Law*" These abominable declarations exhibit the Man of Sin, who exalts himself above God; and the fact, in relation to the second commandment being left out of the Decalogue, by the Church of Rome, shows, that to the present hour the same sentiment is still entertained—that there is a power to alter the law of God, and dispense with its obligation. If I had not one argument but this to advance against the Church of Rome, it is quite sufficient to demonstrate her heresy and departure from the faith, and brand her with the deepest, ever-during infamy.

The Council of Trent, in session 25, says, "That the images of Christ, and of the blessed Virgin Mother of God, and other saints, are to be *kept* and *reserved*, especially in churches, and due honour and veneration to be given to them—not for that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, for which they are to be worshipped, or that any thing is to be asked of them, or any confidence placed in them, as was anciently done by the heathens, who put their trust in idols, but, because the *honour* which is exhibited to *images* is *referred* to the *prototype*, or *thing represented* by them; so that by the image which we *kiss*, and *before* which we *kneel*, or *put off* our *hats*, we *adore Christ*, and *reverence* his *saints*, whom the said images represent." Again, the same council commands all bishops to teach the people "the *legitimate use* of *images*." Hence, images are retained and honoured, as they term it, in the Church of Rome to the present day, and must be so as long as she remains "unchangeable and unchanged." We may notice the following as among the most noted:—1. A picture of God the Father, as a wrinkled, venerable old man; the Son, with a circular glory around his head; and the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove. This picture of the Trinity is found in the authorised Roman Breviary. 2. The crucifix made of wood, brass, silver, or gold, as a likeness of Christ on the cross. 3. The cross, whether made of wood, stone, or even imprinted on paper. 4. Images and pictures of the Virgin Mary. A stone image of her is no unusual thing, placed in a niche, either in or outside of a chapel, in Ireland. The people never fail to fulfil the Trent decree, in relation to such an image as this. 5. The images of other saints. Thus, she represents *Moses* with horns—*Michael* with a spear killing the Devil—St. *Peter* with keys—St. *John* with a chalice—St. *James* with the shells of

fishes—St. *Paul* with a sword—St. *Cecilia* with a harp—St. *Patrick* with serpents—St. *Gertrude* with rats—St. *George* with a dragon—Paul, the *hermit*, with a raven bringing him a piece of bread—*Anthony*, of *Egypt*, frightening the Devil with a leer—*Thomas Aquinas* with angels girding his loins, to save him from concupiscence—*Athanasius* concealed in a corner, while a spider spins her web to hide him from the Arian Bishops—and, lastly, *Anthony*, of *Padua*, with a mallet in his hand, bruising the heads of heretics. This, of course, is a very gratifying representation, inasmuch as no faith is to be kept with heretics; and he that kills the greatest number does God the greatest service! It is not marvellous, therefore, that contrary to the account given by St. Luke, the first martyr, Stephen, should be exhibited in the stern attitude of a gladiator, with a large stone in his hand, ready, of course, to return it with vengeance on the head of his heretical murderers! This is quite in accordance with her wonted mildness, as the church militant upon earth! On this decree of the Council of Trent, respecting image worship, I remark as follows:—

1. It is *directly repugnant* to the *second commandment:* it is an unholy, counter decree. The decree of Nebuchadnezzar, that all people should worship the golden image, set up by him on the plains of Dura, was not more opposed to the glory and honour of the God of Daniel, than this is to the God of Moses, and of Christianity. Let the reader note the matter thus:—1. The Holy Trinity, the Virgin Mary, and several of the saints worshipped in the Church of Rome, are surely in *heaven above;* the commandment forbids the making of any image or likeness of them, were it even a picture. 2. The commandment forbids the making of them; the Council of Trent commands it. 3. The commandment calls upon men to put them away; the council decrees them to be kept and reserved, especially in churches. 4. The commandment forbids the bowing down to them, or serving them; the Council of Trent commands its votaries to take off their hats, kneel, kiss, honour, venerate, and adore them. 5. The commandment curses those who do such a thing, and the council curses those who do not. 6. The council confesses that the images of the heathen were idols, and the worship of them idolatry; what then are the images of the Church of Rome? Are they not idols also? Have they not the same common name of *images?* Are they not representations of things unseen? Are they not made of the same material? What difference is there between an image of Jupiter, Brahmin, or Vishnu, and a crucifix, suppose they are all made of brass, or silver, or gold, or wood, or iron, or stone? None whatever, except in the mere shape. The one image was made by the hand of a heathen; the other by that of a member of the true church. The one was consecrated by a priest of Budhu, and the other by a priest of the Man of Sin. The former was manufactured without a knowledge of law, and the latter in despite of one of the strongest, plainest, and most authoritative laws which God ever gave to mankind. There is a difference here in point of guilt and curse. 7.

It is evident, by the very words used in this decree of the Council of Trent, that if the veneration, honour, or worship, which the Papists render to images, does not pass on from them to their prototypes—that if, in worshipping a crucifix, it does not pass on to Christ—or if, in worshipping an image of the Virgin Mary, it does not pass on to her—then it is rank idolatry, the same as that of the heathen; and these images are but idols. One thing is granted, that the external form of devotion is first decreed to them, as kneeling, &c.; and another thing is evident, that whatever worship Christ, or the Virgin, receives, falls first on the image, and then goes afterwards to the prototype. Thus, the faith, affection, and devotion, like so many rays of light, must pass through this prison, or beam on the invisible object from this reflecting medium. Do they not thus become mediators, although dumb ones to be sure? Is not this the very idolatry prohibited in the Scriptures? Let us examine this briefly:—

2. The golden calf made by Aaron, and the two set up by Jeroboam, caused Israel to sin. They were charged with idolatry, and yet it is evident, that none of the children of Israel considered any of them as Jehovah, the true God; but as mere images of him, through which they worshipped him. Hence, the Psalmist saith, "They changed their glory into the similitude of an ox that eateth grass;" and St. Paul, speaking of the idolatry of the Gentiles, in Rom. i. 22, 23, says, "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." The idolatry here spoken of in both cases, is not merely the worship of an idol, as the true and only God, but the worship of the image or idol as a representation of him. Where there is an image or picture there must be an original, and hence, the worship of the Gentile world, according to St. Paul, did not deny the incorruptible God, but worshipped him in a manner everywhere condemned in Scripture. Now, I ask, what is the worship of the Church of Rome better than this? Wherein does it differ? Will God accept of the distinctions made about *relative* and *absolute* worship—the worship of *Duleia* and *Latreia*, *inferior* and *supreme* worship? The thing is still done—the evil of the old idolatry is perpetuated—an idol with a Christian name is still adored in the crucifix, and all the sophistry in the world cannot free the church of Rome from this charge.

3. In the book of Judges xvii. 1—6, we read, that "There was a man, whose name was Micah, and he said unto his mother, the eleven hundred shekels of silver that were taken from thee, about which thou cursedst, and spakest of also in mine ears, behold the silver is with me; I took it. And his mother said, Blessed of the Lord, my son." And when he had restored it, she said, "I had wholly dedicated the silver unto the Lord from my hand for my son to make a *graven image* and a *molten image*." We are then told, that she "took two hundred shekels of silver, and gave them to the founder, who made thereof a graven image, and a molten

image; and the man, Micah, had an house of gods, and made an ephod and teraphim, and consecrated one of his sons, who became his priest. In those days there was no King in Israel, and every man did that which was right in his own eyes." Here I cannot help remarking the similarity between Micah's mother and the Church of Rome. 1. She was fond of money; so is that church. 2. She cursed and blessed almost in the same breath; so does the Church of Rome; for blessing and cursing sound frequently from the same altar on the same day. 3. She was the first that corrupted the worship of the true God after the death of Joshua; so the Church of Rome was the first that did so after the death of Christ. 4. She consecrated her money to the Lord, and then made graven images of only a part of it; and, hence, her piety, even in her own way, was of a very mixed character; so the Church of Rome consecrates a part to the Lord and his worship, but keeps the greater share to herself. A captain once at sea, in a storm, made a vow to the Virgin Mary, that if she would bring him safely to land, he would burn a candle to her honour, as large as the mast of his vessel. Being reminded on shore of his promise, he said a farthing candle might well serve her. 5. She caused her son and grandson to break the second commandment, by worshipping graven images; and so the Church of Rome instructs all bishops and priests to teach the faithful "the legitimate use of images." 6. If reproved for her conduct by a true Israelite, no doubt she would have told him, "I am mother and mistress in my own family—you have no right to dictate to me. We do not worship the images, we only keep them there to remind us of the true God—the silver was consecrated to him—and the worship is perfectly right, because we look through every thing to him;" so in all likelihood, Mr. S. will defend his new mother by arguments not superior in the least, forgetting the second commandment and the dreadful evils that are incurred.

4. No crucifix or image must be used until it be *first devoutly consecrated* by the priest. The prayer of consecration is—"We implore thee, O Lord, Holy Father, omnipresent and everlasting God, that thou wilt vouchsafe to bless this wood of thy cross, that it may be to mankind a healthful remedy, the strengthener of faith, an inciter to good works, the redemption of souls, and that it may be a comfort, protection, and safeguard against the cruel darts of their enemies, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Surely the same power that can change bread into Christ's body in ten thousand places at once, and yet give him but one body, can easily change a piece of matter into a god, as Minutius Felix says, "Behold, it (the metal) is melted, forged, and yet is not a god! Behold, it is gilt, finished, erected, and yet it is not a god! Behold, it is adorned, consecrated, and worshipped, and *then* it is a God!" The cross is now consecrated, and hence it is to be worshipped! We have, therefore, in the Breviary the following address:—"Hail, O cross! my only hope; do thou, in this glory of triumph, *increase grace* to the *pious*, and *blot out the crimes* of *the guilty*." And again,

"Thy cross we adore, O Lord!" Thomas Aquinas, who was canonized in the Church of Rome, thus writes:—"We yield the *worship* of *Latreia* to that in which we place the hope of salvation. But we place the hope of salvation in the cross of Christ; for the church says, 'Hail, O cross! our *only hope;* do thou in this passion season increase righteousness to the pious, and grant pardon to the guilty.' Therefore, the cross of Christ is to be adored with the adoration of Latreia." Here the idolatry is not only confessed, but gloried in. How great is the virtue of the priest's prayer! for it can change a piece of wood that sprang out of the earth, and was nourished by the dew of heaven, into a god, and, in opposition to all the threatenings of God, both by Moses and the Apostles, against idolatry, can command worship of the highest kind, even the worship of Latreia, to be given to a piece of timber! How great is the virtue of St. Peter's keys! They have changed error into infallibility—heathenism into Christianity—saints, relics, and images into gods; and hence set up another ladder between earth and heaven, independently of that of the Gospel, whereby sin itself, with the javelin of death in its hand, and the brand of idolatry in its forehead, may ascend up into glory, with curses against the truth in its mouth, and call itself orthodox and holy! The Council of Trent, by its decree in relation to saints, relics, and images, set itself up in opposition to Him who sits on the holy hill of Zion.

5. How innumerable are the evils resulting from this idolatrous worship? God is dishonoured—his laws are trampled on—his authority is set at defiance—his word is despised—his Gospel is corrupted—the hearts of men are hardened—the understanding blinded—the affections are vitiated—talents are misapplied—contentions are kept up—and the incomes of the people are prostituted to support a priesthood, literally sworn to support error, and shut out the light of divine truth; and worse than all this, the jealous anger of God hangs over the heads of the people, age after age, because one generation follows the wickedness of another, in breaking the second commandment of that law, which never will, nor can be repealed. The man, therefore, who has any regard for God's glory—any love for his kingdom and pure laws—any spark of genuine patriotism in his bosom, is bound to use every means that God has put within his grasp, to enlighten his fellow-countrymen, and lead them to the simple truth, as it is in the Gospel of Christ Jesus, the common Lord of all; and to whom all must finally give an account.

Mr. Sibthorp, in page 44, observes, "It has been most justly remarked, by some who are not of her communion, that there is a deep devotional feeling, and an ardour of piety in the present day among many, and these an increasing number, which find not scope for their exercise, nor sufficient help for their developement, in any form or section of Protestantism; and that the Catholic Church alone presents a *fair field* for their exercise." Here is a fair field, indeed, both for faith and works—for inward confidence, and outward devotions. Mr. Sibthorp, and his jesuitical brethren tho

Puseyites, may now traverse it at large. It is not a field of the Lord God's planting. It is a field containing the mingled seed of Heathenism, Judaism, and Christianity. The field of the Gospel was sold by the Popes for money, as Judas sold his Master for thirty pieces of silver; and with the price they have purchased this "field of blood"—this valley of dry bones, of relics, and images. Here is a "fair field" for devotion indeed! For by the time Mr. Sibthorp pays his devotions to all the saints—worships all the images—venerates all the relics—visits all the holy places, wells, and trees—hangs a rag on every bush, as the poor Irish do on such occasions, and distributes his devotion over all the deities in the field, it is likely his stock will become exhausted, and he will be constrained to draw on his Puseyite brethren, who have such large stores in reservation, that they are agitating for a free trade between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. He and they need labour under no dread of space enough to traverse. The superstition of the Africans, and the idolatry of China and the East Indies, lies before them. The fields, in thousands of instances, intersect each other, and enclose a common space. The Silites, or pillar saints of the east, however, will, in all likelihood, excel them in ardour. There is a mode of confessing sin in Japan, related in Acasta's History of the Indies, which, if the priests and Puseyites adopted in this country, might save an infinity of trouble, and a great expenditure of devotion in the "fair field" of the Romish Church. The priest has a large beam and scales suspended over a dreadful precipice, which he manages by machinery. The pilgrim, or devotee, who has been hunting over the "fair field" of devotion, places himself in the one scale, and of course the light one ascends. The priest then calls on him to confess all his sins without reservation, on pain of instant death. As he confesses, the machinery gets in motion; and when the beam comes to an equilibrium, the priest pronounces absolution, the pilgrim pays his fees, and another takes the scale in turn. This is a capital invention; and should any of the priests or Puseyites adopt it, it will excel in popularity all the other inventions of the Church of Rome. It would be no disgrace to borrow this from the heathen, as that church stands already under so many obligations to paganism, especially in relation to images and ceremonies.

Section X.—Worship in an Unknown Tongue.

We now pass, with an easy transition, from the objects worshipped by Mr. Sibthorp to the mode in which he, as a priest of the Church of Rome, conducts it. He must bear with us while we protest against the mode as well as the thing itself. It is well known to the world, that for ages the Church of Rome, *alias* the Latin Church, celebrates her mass and conducts her public worship in the Latin tongue, which, though one of the learned languages, is a dead one to the people, and utterly unknown to 999 out of every 1,000. Her practice, in this respect, is confirmed by the cursing

Council of Trent. It is remarkable, that this service was first apapointed by Pope Vitalian, in the year 666. About that time, he sent Theodore and Adrian to introduce and establish it in England. The number 666 is rather ominous, inasmuch as it constitutes the number of the Apocalyptic beast, and, of course, might *intimate*, that the Latin service is one of the chief marks of an *apostate church*. On this, however, we do not dwell at present; we only wish to take up the thing as we find it, and examine it in a rational and Scriptural manner. Let the following observations be well considered:—

1. The faculties of the mind have been divided into those of *perception* and *volition*. The former, of course, includes, *the understanding*, and the latter, *the will* of man. By the one we receive *knowledge*, and by the other we *act*. The Divine Being has given both faculties; the one that we may know him; the other, that we may put our knowledge into operation and obey him. This is his design as the author of nature; but does the service of the mass in an unknown tongue comply with this design? It does not. It conveys no light to the understanding; it communicates no ideas whatever, unless what may be received by the eye. The whole is mere jargon, unintelligible gibberish to the vulgar. The imagination may rise into the wildest flights, and raise the affections to their greatest pitch; but reason lies prostrate—a veil is kept over the eye of the soul—knowledge is thus shut out, and "ignorance becomes the mother of devotion." The celebration of mass in an unknown tongue, contradicts the very constitution of nature; it makes idiots of those who do not understand, and places them below the standard of brutal instinct. The summons of the hen is understood by her chickens. The horse, the dog, and other animals, of less sagacity, soon understand the voice of their master; but the language of the priest when celebrating the highest mysteries of his religion, is totally unknown to the clown, and leaves his mind a mere *tabula rasa*—a smooth table on which good or ill may be written, as the priest chooses to inscribe it. So far as the mass, therefore, is concerned, the people can know nothing of God—of his word, his laws, or his ways; and the corrupt will of man is thus left to follow the dictates of a dark understanding and unenlightened conscience, and hence the wickedness of the peasantry is the result of their religion in conjunction with the native corruption of the human heart. The light of truth is withheld, and darkness, therefore, must abide within. The Latin mass is a pall which the Church of Rome has cast over the dead congregations of her community, while she conducts them, with an awful pomp and ceremony, to the invisible region, where every man must ultimately give an account of himself to God.

2. This practice is a standing insult to the *good providence* of *God*, and to *every improvement* which has taken place in the world. The Latin language was once the vernacular tongue—the language of the Roman Empire. To have worship in it at that time, was neither unreasonable nor unscriptural, because the people under-

stood it then, as we do the English or Irish now. In the notes to the Rhemish Testament concerning the beast mentioned in the 13th chapter of Revelations, we find the Roman Empire ranked as one of his heads. God was pleased, in the order of his providence, to destroy that head. The Latin was the language of its tongue, and the Church of Rome, unconsciously of course, carries the horn or *tongue* of that head along with her, and commands that it should be displayed every where as a relic of her identity and regard, and hence, service is universally conducted in that tongue. She thus becomes identified with the beast, and sets herself in opposition to the providence of God. It was the will of God that, that empire should cease—that its language should not be perpetuated any more than that of any other fallen empire—the Macedonian or Greek for instance; and yet she perpetuated its language, gives life to the image of the beast, and causes all, both small and great, to fall down and worship it. God, by his providence, would say, that his worship should be conducted in the tongue of that nation which he raises up to fill the place of that which he puts down; but her decree establishes the contrary, and would preserve, in opposition to him, what he would destroy by his providence. The improvement in science and in arts, produced by the invention of printing, are nothing to her. She despises translations, although they could now be so easily made, and seems resolved to adhere to her absurdities, until she is consumed in piece-meal by the breath of Christ in his word. Let her not, however, have the effrontery any more to deny that she is an enemy to improvement, and that she wears, in this enlightened age, the badge of the leaden and dark centuries of Christianity. Her mass in an unknown tongue, is a decided mark of her origin, and a proof that she neither fears God nor regards the instruction of men. It is a land-mark raised against the tide of improvement—a magic lantern in which she shows herself as the mother of harlots, and an ill-polished mirror in which we can descry superstition clad in ignorance, putting out the eyes of her followers. If there be light among them of any kind, it never beamed from the candles of the mass; but is reflected from that very Protestantism that she now despises, and would really overthrow. The only revenge, however, we will take of her, is just to shine on.

3. The celebration of mass in an unknown tongue, is a stigma on the intellect, the education, and the circumstances of the laity; it marks their degradation as unworthy of being made acquainted with *the highest mysteries* of their religion. Would Protestants submit to such a service? No. Then why do the Roman Catholic laity? Because they are completely under the feet of their priests, arising from the communications made in the confessional. This is the chain which binds them to the horn of the beast, and makes them submit to be licked to death by his antiquated tongue. Is there any thing more degrading to any people, than to attend for hours on a service which they do not understand? The eye sees the priest, and observes his various genuflections; the ear hears

the sounding of the bell—the instruction ceases here, so far as the mass is concerned. It is to the millions a complete pantomime—a dumb show—a mere panorama of heathenism blended with Christianity, in which the former is exhibited in the most striking point of view, while the latter constitutes its shade. In fact, it is a rugged hill, or barren moor, which never can be rendered productive by the shining of the Sun of Righteousness, or the falling of the fruitful showers of his Spirit; and that exhibits its inhabitants in a state of savage nature, sheer ignorance, spiritual stupidity, and priestly domination; and leaves them, like a set of hungry and silly sheep, without any higher knowledge than to follow the sound of the bell-weather.

4. The *celebration* of *worship* in an *unknown tongue* is *directly contrary to Scripture*. Who can reconcile it with the 14th chap. of 1st Corinthians? Not all the Doctors of Trent—nor all the Jesuits in the world. Examine briefly what the Apostle saith. He shows:—1. That it is contrary to one *great design* of worship, which is, the edification, instruction, and comfort of the people. "For he that speaketh in an unknown tongue, speaketh not unto men, but unto God, for no man understandeth him. But he that prophesieth (or explains the Scripture) speaketh unto men, to edification, and exhortation, and comfort." (Ver. 2, 3.) Is it not evident from this, that what is *not understood*, if it came even from the Spirit of inspiration himself, can never edify, instruct, persuade, or comfort the people. The mass, therefore, is condemned in this. 2. He reasons from the *absurdity* of the thing, and produces a popular illustration or two to point out the folly of speaking in an unknown tongue. "Even things without life, giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped? For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle? So likewise you, except ye utter with the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken?" (Verses 7, 8, 9) Let the pipers and harpers of the Church of Rome, who, in their mass, utter low, discordant notes which cannot be understood, answer these queries. Let the trumpeters of that church, who every Sabbath utter the same unmeaning sound, reply to the Apostle. They cannot. Scripture, common sense, and the habits of civilized men, are against their "Latin worship, and their wafer gods." 3. The Apostle tells us expressly, that service in an unknown tongue is a *barbarous custom*. "Therefore, if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me." (Verse 11.) Hear this, ye Romanists! The Apostle shows, that your priests, in the mass, are *barbarians—foreigners—strangers* to you. They do not belong to Christ, but to the Pope; and if you hear them speak in an unknown tongue, you also do not belong to Christ. For Christ saith (John x. 27) "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me;" and, verse 5, "A stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him; for they know not the

voice of strangers." This demonstrates, that the mass is not of God—that its priests are not ministers of Christianity—and that the people who hear them follow after a thief and a robber, and not after Christ. 4. The Apostle condemns speaking in an unknown tongue, because all present cannot say—*Amen.* "How shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say amen at thy giving of thanks; seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?" To what purpose then do the people attend the mass? They receive no instruction, and can say amen to no public prayer. Might they not as well abide at home? 5. The Apostle shows, that such a practice is an *abuse* of the *very design* of speech. "Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not; but prophesying serveth not for them that believe not, but for them that believe." (Verse 22) Here he shows, that the chief design of speaking in an unknown tongue, was for the conviction of unbelievers, and for those who understood it; and the design of prophesying or preaching in an known tongue, was for the edification of believers. Neither of these ends is answered by the service of the mass, and hence it is a prostitution of the very design of speech. 6. The Apostle next shows, that such conduct brings a *reproach* upon *religion.* "If, therefore, the whole church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned or unbelievers, will they not say you are mad?" (Verse 23.) What could a Mahomedan or Bramin say else, were he present at the mass? He learns, that no man understands any thing of the matter but the priest; and has very good reason, in the estimation of the Apostle, to conclude, that they are either bedlamites or fools. Lastly, the Apostle declares, that what he writes on this subject are "*the commandments* of the Lord" (verse 37) and hence, it is evident to every one, that the Church of Rome, by denying her community the benefit of service in the vernacular tongue, has set herself up in direct opposition to God; and that the Council of Trent, by saying, "Whoever shall affirm, that the mass should be celebrated in the vernacular language only, let him be accursed," have actually cursed Paul in heaven, and the Holy Spirit that inspired him!

Section XI.—The Church of Rome is not a Church of Christ.

The tenth article in Mr. Sibthorp's new creed, relates to the power of indulgences; but having dwelt on that abominable abuse of every thing sacred, in my Letters to O'Connell, to them I refer the reader, where he will find a list of crimes, and the several sums to be paid for the indulgence. Our great business now is with the *Church* of Rome. According to the eleventh article in the creed of Pius IV., Mr. S. has sworn on the Holy Gospels, that she is the Mother of all churches, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic; that St. Peter was Prince of the Apostles; and that the Pope of Rome is

not only Peter's successor, but the Vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth. Now, in this article there is not one word of truth—the whole is a tissue of falsehood. Hitherto there has been too much yielded to the Church of Rome. Many Protestants have conceded the point, that she is still a visible church of Christ, and that salvation is still within her precincts. With such writers I cannot agree. I deny her to be a church of Christ in any sense whatever. That some of her members may obtain salvation, I have no hesitation in yielding; but it is neither by faith in her creed, nor in obedience to her commands; it arises from that very Protestantism which she has taught them to despise. There can be no salvation in apostate principles, or corrupt commands. It is with her standard creeds and formularies in which these are embodied, we have now to do. This is a question where judgment, and not charity, is now concerned. Bellarmine, in his notes of the church, says, "*Omnes confitentur, in sola vera Ecclesia esse veram fidem, veram peccatorum remissionem, veram spem salutis eternæ*," viz., "It is confessed by all, that in the true church alone there is the true faith, the true remission of sin, and the true hope of eternal life." To this declaration we can frame no objection. Mr. Sibthorp will agree with the Cardinal, that the Church of Rome alone is the true church; but that she has not the true faith, is abundantly proved already—that she has not the true remission of sin, is a necessary consequence of her being without the true faith; and hence, as a church, she is destitute of those means which inspire and secure the hope of eternal life. This is a very grave charge—it is one which is fully substantiated already; but to bring down her assumptions, we have no objection now to enter the precincts of the Church of Rome along with Mr. Sibthorp—survey the foundation and the superstructure of the building—examine the pillars, altars, and decorations, and then decide whether it be the stately, beautiful, and spiritual fabric alluded to by our Lord, or an ill-planned, earthly, temporary building, with sand for its foundation, and wood, hay, and stubble, for its material; in fact, whether it be the new Jerusalem coming down from heaven, or not one whit better than the capital of the Mahomedan empire. This now is the question to be decided; and in order to do so, we must inquire into the import of the term church.

The term church is applied, in its most simple form, to the mob collected by Demetrius the silver smith, in opposition to Paul, and his preaching in Ephesus (Acts xix. 32) "Some cried one thing, and some another, for the assembly *(ecclesia)*" or church, "was confused; and the most part knew not wherefore they were come together." In this sense, it is applicable to the mobs which follow O'Connell in Dublin, Tralee, &c., and to the majority of those who are seen kneeling either on the floor, or in the gutter before a mass-house. It means, therefore, an assembly, or congregation of people, either good or bad, and might be used to designate a gathering of infidels or of Mahomedans; and hence, the true Church of Christ must have some scriptural marks to distinguish it from all

other societies. Secondly, it means the believers of a family, &c. (Romans xvi. 3—5) "Greet Priscilla, and Aquila, my helpers in Christ Jesus; likewise greet the *Church* that is in *their house.*" Surely, Paul in this passage did not mean the Church of Rome, or else it must have been confined to one family. Thirdly, the term is applied to the pastors and members of a particular church, of which a man is a member. "And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto *the Church.*" (Matt. xviii. 17.) Our Lord cannot mean the priests of the Romish Church, for at the time he spoke, and for a long time afterwards, they had no existence. Fourthly, it means the followers of Christ in one particular city, or district. Hence, we read of the church at Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, Rome; but there is a vast difference between the Church of Rome *at* or in Rome, and the Church *of Rome* in Ireland, or elsewhere. Lastly, it has a more extensive application than all this, for in the following Scriptures, it embraces *true believers* in all places, and in all ages, to the end of time. "On this rock I will build *my church,*" &c.; "And gave him to be the head over all things to *his church.*" (Eph. i. 22.) "Might be known by *the church* the manifold wisdom of God." (Eph. iii. 10.) "Unto him be glory in *the church* throughout all ages." (Verse 21.) Such are the several applications of the term church in the Scriptures. What then is the true, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of Christ, in all ages of the world? It is that great multitude of all nations, kindreds, tongues, sects, and parties, who have obeyed the call of Christ's word and Spirit; who have believed in his name; and who have washed their robes from guilt and sin, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. These, and these alone, constitute the whole family or Church of God, whether in heaven or in earth. We may call them the universal or invisible Church of Christ. The Church of Rome, by her trickery and imposition, would substitute herself in place of these; and hence make the impression, that there is no salvation out of her pale! Let us now examine her pretensions, even as a *visible* church, and try if she can make a valid claim to rank among those which exist in Cristendom. A few observations will place this in a clear light:—

1. *A true visible Church holds Christ alone as the head.* This is evident from the following Scriptures:—"To us there is but *one* God, even the Father, and *one* Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. viii. 6.) "Grow up into him in all things who is *the head*, even *Christ.*" (Eph. iv. 15.) "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as *Christ* is the *head* of *the church.*" (Chap. v. 23.) "And he is the *head* of the *body* the *church.*" (Col. i. 18.) "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and *not holding the head*, from which all the body, by joints and bands have nourishment ministered, and knit together, increasing with the increase of God." (Col. ii. 18, 19.) "Call *no man* your father upon the earth; for *one* is your father which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters; for *one* is *your*

master, even *Christ.*" (Matt. xxiii. 9, 10.) From these Scriptures, it is manifest, that the true church, in every age of the world, holds Christ, and him alone, as the head. It is, therefore, distinguished from the present Jewish Church that denies him—from the Mahomedan Church, that holds the false prophet as the head; and also from the Church of Rome, which adheres to his holiness, the Pope, as visible head of the church. The word Pope, from *Papa*, Father, is applied to the head of the Romish Church, in direct opposition to the command of Christ: "Call no man on earth your Father." What is the inference from this? Either that the Pope is the Lord God himself, as he has been often blasphemously styled, or else, that the Church of Rome unchurches herself, by confessing a head forbidden in the divine word. According to her own confession, she has a *visible* and *invisible* head—one on earth, and one in heaven; and hence, she must be "knit together" by "joints and bands" to each of those heads, and thus form as curious a phenomenon in religion as the Siamese Twins did in nature. Christ and the Pope, holiness and sin, religion and the world, light and darkness, are thus blended into one, and the conjunction so earnestly contended for by her votaries, demonstrates the invalidity of her claim to be a true church.

2. *A visible true church receives the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as her only infallible guide and rule.* "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me." (John x. 27.) "He that is of God, heareth God's words; ye, therefore, hear them not, because ye are not of God." (John viii. 27.) "Ye are my friends, if ye *do* whatsoever *I command you.*" (John xv. 14.) The Scriptures *alone* contain God's voice and words to mankind. This is proved by the following passages:—"*Ye* shall *not add* unto the *word* which I command you; neither shall ye *diminish* aught from it." (Deut. iv. 2.) "If any man" (whether Pope or Priest) "shall *add* unto these things, God shall *add* unto him all the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall *take away* from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall *take away* his part out of the book of life." (Rev. xxii. 18, 19.) "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever *I* have commanded you; and, lo, *I* am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. xxviii. 20.) The true church is guided by these declarations, and deviates not from them. Not so the Church of Rome. Does she not add vain traditions to the word?—the apocrypha to the Old and New Testaments? Has she not taken from it by suppressing the *second commandment?* Does she not oppose it by prohibiting the laity from reading it? Is she, therefore, free from the plagues and curses pronounced by God? Can the authorities of that church escape? Who will keep their names in the book of life, if God blots them out? The very name and memory of Doyle have already nearly perished, who exhorted the peasant to bury the Bible with "a tongs."

3. *A true visible church administers and receives the true ordinances of Christ.* These are baptism and the Lord's Supper.

There are no others mentioned in the word of God. For these we have the command of Christ—"Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." (Matt. xxviii. 19.) "The Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took *bread* and blessed it, and said, Take eat; this do in *remembrance* of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: *drink ye all of it.*" (1 Cor. xi. 24, 25.) Such is the practice of the true church in all ages. She baptizes simply with water, and uses neither cream nor spittle. She administers and receives the sacrament in *both kinds.* She does not acknowledge seven sacraments instead of two, because she cannot find them in the word of God, and would tremble to incur his displeasure by inventing them. Not so the Church of Rome! She has added to the true ordinances her own inventions; and detracted from them by her corrupt practices. From the year 1215 up to this hour, not one of the laity of the Church of Rome ever received the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The cup was denied them, in direct opposition to the example and command of our Lord, who said, "Drink ye all of it." They did not receive Christ's body, because the priest gave them *only bread;* and they received not the bread as a *sign*, but as the *reality*, which it was not; and hence, neither receiving the sign nor the substance, they have been cheated out of the true ordinance since that period.

4. *A true visible church renders unto God the true worship demanded in his word.* The following language of inspiration proves this position:—"Thou shalt have *no other* Gods before (or besides) me." "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." (Matt. iv. 10.) "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, &c.; thou shalt *not bow down thyself to them*, nor *serve them*," &c. The true church observes all these precepts. She worships God alone, through Jesus Christ, the only Mediator. Does the Church of Rome worship only in this way? Does she not pray to saints and angels, worship the host, and make images of Christ? Is a gold, silver, or brass crucifix, the likeness of nothing in earth or heaven? Is the host not like another cake of the same size? Is a saint or an angel the true God, whom we are to serve, and serve only? Does she not break even in her worship the *first* and *the second commandment?* Let Mr. S. exculpate her if he can.

In attending to the marks of the church, I abide by these four, and will abide. I will accept of no other characteristics, if these be wanting in the Church of Rome. *Catholic* Church will not do, because she is *not universal.* *Antiquity* goes for nothing in her case, because Judaism is even older than Christianity; Paganism than Judaism; and sin older than either. *Multitude* will not do, inasmuch as the Mahomedans and Pagans out-number her by far. *Uninterrupted duration* is also of no value in proving her the Church of Christ, for these systems and their supporters have that

mark also; and as for *holiness*, we must deny its application to wicked Popes, Bishops, Priests, and people; and much less can we admit of holy oil, water, spittle, salt, ashes, and bones, with all the trumpery included in relics. Hence, it is evident, that she does not possess one single mark essential to a true visible Church of Christ. If so, what now becomes of our Puseyites—of the Apostolic succession men? They claim her as their mother in these things. They have no other to whom they can flee, to assist them in their assumptions. Do they not renounce Christ as the head—deny the true interpretation of the Scriptures—abuse the ordinances of Christ, by their doctrine of sacramental grace—and deviate from the true worship of God, by following her example? Have not some of them placed candles on the altar, thereby testifying, that their god also cannot see in the dark? They are the greatest enemies to the established church of these countries, which have appeared since the Reformation. The people must become Papists who receive their instructions, or submit to their pretensions.

Mr. Sibthorp promises and swears true obedience to the Church of Rome. Examine candidly what he has done. He has not only repaired to a church which has not one essential mark of a true one, but which bears upon her forehead—MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS, AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH!" (Rev. xvii. 5.) She is arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, indicating the dress of her Popes, Cardinals, Bishops, and Priests; and decked with gold, precious stones, and pearls, expressive of her covetousness, external splendour, and outward worship. Thus she appears of the earth, earthy; and stands distinguished from the true church (Rev. xii. 1) who is represented as clothed with the Sun of Righteousness, having the moon, or all changeable things, under her feet; and crowned with the twelve stars of Apostolic doctrine. All true ministers of Christ have their succession in connexion with this church, whether she shines in the heavens, or is driven into the wilderness. The Popish Priests and Puseyites have their succession from the Mother of Harlots, and hence they participate in her spirit of mystery, ambition, worldly-mindedness, external show, and persecution. She gave her Apostolic chain to Pope Joan, and it has descended as an heir-loom to the offspring of both. St. Paul drops the idea of the church collectively, and depicts the succession of the Popes. Hence, the noted passage in 2 Thes. ii. 3, 4, "Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a *falling away* first, and that MAN OF SIN be revealed, *the son* of *perdition;* who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." Here now is ANTICHRIST. This Man of Sin was fully revealed in 606, when Boniface III. proclaimed himself universal bishop. He then began to live, and show himself openly against Christ. Various conceits have been entertained, in former ages, respecting Antichrist. Some have said he would be born of a virgin, by the power of Satan; others, that

he would be "a real devil, assuming false flesh." Some have fancied he would be a compound of man and devil. But a favourite notion of the Papists was, that he would be a Jew begotten by Satan, and that his mother would be of the tribe of Dan. This was the most militant of all the Jewish tribes, and, of course, they expected that Antichrist, like St. Dominick, would be expert in the use of the sword. Perhaps, this conceit is not so very far beside the truth, for Antichrist being a Jew by his mother, and a Pagan by his father, might unite the religion of both under the mask of Christianity. The term *anti* signifies not only *for* or *instead*, implying deputyship, but also *against*, denoting enmity and opposition. It is, therefore, applicable to the succession of Popes in both cases. They have made themselves Christ's vicars or deputies, and, as the Man of Sin, opposed him openly before heaven and earth. This will appear evident from the following considerations. This opposition has been displayed

1. To CHRIST'S PERSON. This they have done in transubstantiation. He has a true body in heaven. They, in their creed and consecrations, annihilate this, give him one of bread—nay, ten thousand at the same time. They destroy the real Christ, and set up a fictitious one of their own making. Thereby they contradict his own word, that he "sat down for ever on the right hand of God." This dogma of theirs degrades him, by subjecting him to the unholy consecration of a priest, and the various accidents of a piece of bread. He may be stolen, or lost, or carried away by vermin; or become stale and mouldy. "Every spirit," saith St. John, "that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God. And every spirit that confesseth not that Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God: and this is that spirit of Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come." The spirit which confesses that Christ is come in the flesh, assigns to him a real, true identity —a palpable and definite body, whose subsistence precludes the possibility of another Christ; but the Popes, Bishops, Priests, and Church of Rome, with the Council of Trent, make him come, not in the flesh—not as he was born of the Virgin Mary, but in the form of a round cake; and hence, the whole in succession is *Antichrist*.

2. His ATTRIBUTES are subjected to the same denial and opposition. This is done by ascribing them to creatures—to the Virgin Mary, saints, and angels. The whole succession of Popes, Bishops, Priests, and people, addressing their prayers to them, acknowledge their omnipresence and omniscience, in common with Christ. If they are not omnipresent and omniscient, why pray to them? As certainly as the prayers are thus addressed, Christ's attributes are ascribed to them. His glory is thus given away; and hence Christ is denied and insulted. Is not this ANTICHRIST again? Take a more striking instance. There is that wafer. It is now consecrated by the priest; hence, it is the real Christ—the Christ that created the world; but then it is without life, motion, energy, or even power to elevate itself as an object of worship. The priest

must do this for it; and hence it follows, that the world was created by a being without life, motion, or energy—one inferior to the priest in these attributes; and, therefore, that the priest is greater than Christ. Here the Man of Sin exalteth himself above all that is called God; and is not this *Antichrist?*

3. The TITLES and NAMES of Christ are abused in the same manner. The Pope has styled himself the Lord God—the Lamb of God—Papa, or Father—Head of the church—Vicegerent of God upon earth—and emphatically, His Holiness! Does he not thus, like Nebuchadnezzar, set himself up against the most High God? By claiming the titles of Christ, does he not bring Christ down to his level, or elevate himself against Christ? Some Popes have been monsters of iniquity, and yet every one, forsooth, was His Holiness! Is not this assumption, a denial of the titles and genuine holiness of the Creator and Redeemer of the world? If so, then, as St. John declares, "He is ANTICHRIST that denies the Father and the Son."

4. His OFFICES are claimed and opposed by the Popedom. It destroys Christ's office of prophet, by its traditions, infallibility, false doctrines, and dogmas, which overthrow the entire system of Revelation. It is directly repugnant to his priesthood, atonement, and intercession, by substituting another priesthood in his stead—presenting a false offering of his body, both for the living and the dead—and displacing him as the only mediator, by introducing the mediation of saints and angels. The whole Council of Trent, as the representation of the Popedom, in its canons, decrees and curses, was nothing but ANTICHRIST sitting in conclave against God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the kingdom and interests of the Son of God. Is it not entirely repugnant to the kingly office of Christ? Have they not dispensed new laws, altered the terms or conditions of salvation, substituted false pardons for the true, and assumed the dominion over the church and the world? Do they not forbid to marry, and command to abstain from meats? Have they not instituted holy days, unknown to the law or the gospel? Are not the twelve articles of Mr. Sibthorp's new creed, promulgated by Pius IV., the very creed of Antichrist, in opposition to his kingly power? The right of Christ to pardon has been infringed, impugned, and denied, by the confessional; his dominion over the conscience, and the right of private judgment, has been set aside by the false assumption of infallibility. And surely it will not be denied, that when a Pope made an Emperor hold his stirrup, or kiss his toe, or do penance bare-foot at his gate, in the midst of frost and snow, he was aiming at universal empire. The very title of Universal Bishop shows this; and when Pope Eugene IV. gave the Portuguese all the countries they should discover from Cape Nore to India, and Alexander VI. divided the earth between them and the Spaniards, as a boy divides an orange, the assumptions of ANTICHRIST came to a climax; and a demonstration was afforded to all generations, that he claimed the entire world as the patrimony of St. Peter.

5. The MIRACLES of Christ are opposed, and their authority assailed, by the lying wonders in the Church of Rome. The miracles of Christ were evident to the sense, beneficial in their nature, calculated to confirm truth and glorify God; but the hypocritical pretensions to the power of changing the order of nature, characterises the Man of Sin. The Apostle, in 2 Thes. ii. 9, gives this as a distinct mark of the Popish *Antichrist*:—"Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie." Transubstantiation is the greatest mock-miracle in the Church of Rome; it is an evident, multiplied, perpetual, and unvarnished lie. The whole creed of Pius IV. is a lie from beginning to end. God could never bear testimony to a lie; and hence, the miracles of the Church of Rome are either mere legerdemain tricks and monkish frauds imposed on mankind, or they are lying wonders produced by the agency of Satan. The Roman Breviary contains many of these legends. Every priest is bound to read it two hours each day. In Ireland, it is no uncommon thing to find a priest engaged in this exercise even on the top of a coach. Glance at a few of the miracles which are familiar to his eye. A noble lady lent a beautiful horse to the Pope, and the animal having carried the Vicar of Christ, would never permit her to ride him again. What a pity it was not Pope Joan; for the animal might as readily have carried the one as the other, although the noble lady was not in *holy orders*. There is a story there also of a saint, whose head was nearly cut off, but he lived so long as to support it with his hand, while he ran a couple of miles, and laid it down where a church was afterwards built. St. Francis de Paula, a monk, made a boat of his cloak, and he, and several others, sailed across the strait of Sicily. Another of the miracles recorded in the Breviary, is concerning the house in which the blessed Virgin lived. It was carried by angels from Jerusalem to Dalmatia, and from thence to Loretto, in the Pope's dominion: hence, she was called the Lady of Loretto. Such are some of the lessons which poor Mr. Sibthorp is bound daily to repeat in the new school to which he has repaired under the Pope's tuition. The case of Hohenloe's miracles are still in recollection, and those of Father Carroll, in the county of Wexford. The latter resolved, that the former should not have all the glory of miracle-working as a foreigner, when there were so many resources in the Irish church at home. One of his first miracles was performed by jumping on a poor bed-ridden man, and belabouring him so soundly, that he actually made his escape, to the great admiration of the by-standers; who, of course, had no doubt of the fact. An unfortunate woman, who beheld one of his diabolical operations, was seized with hysterics. He trampled on her, so as to break several of her ribs, assigning as a reason, that she was full of devils; and, of course, his Reverence was believed, because he

was infallible! To complete the miracle-working scene, he proceeded to a house, where a child of three years old began to cry in bed. Asserting the devil was in the child, he immediately jumped on its body. Having ordered the mother, in the presence of fifty people, to get a tub of water with some salt, and pouring it on the little victim, whose blood tinged the water, he called out, "Behold a miracle! I have turned the water into blood!" He then turned the tub over, and the edge falling on the neck of the innocent sufferer, completed the scene by death! The priest was tried for his miraculous operations; and the father testified on oath, that he was prevented from saving his child, through the belief that the priest would restore her to life, while the rest of the by-standers made way, on each side, for the evil spirit to pass through, on being driven from the child. It would be endless to descant on the assumptions to this power, the credulity of Papists in submitting to it, or the multitude of silly legends advanced to support it. It is, according to the Apostle, an evident mark of ANTICHRIST.

6. The KINGDOM and FOLLOWERS of Christ have been a chief object of enmity and direct hostility, by the antichristian party, in all ages. This is in accordance with the current testimony of Scripture. Daniel testifies of Antichrist, that "he shall wear out the saints of the Most High." St. John says, "It was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them." Who could enumerate the misrepresentations and lies poured out by Popery against Protestantism? Papists deny assistance to every project for the spiritual benefit of the world; they have established counter institutions—and by every art which Satan could devise, they have endeavoured to overthrow the best concerted plans for the spread of divine truth. To enumerate the persecutions of the Church of Rome would require volumes. Idolatry and cruelty are two principal characters of this antichristian empire. If Rome Pagan slew her thousands, Rome Christian has slain her tens of thousands. Not to mention other cruelties and barbarities, the crusades against the Waldenses and Albigenses, the murders committed by the Duke of Alva in the Netherlands, the massacres in France and Ireland, will probably amount to ten times the number of Christians slain under the ten persecutions of heathen Rome. What immense quantities of blood have been shed by her agents! Chares IX. of France, in his letter to Pope Gregory XIII., boasts, that in, and not long after the massacre of Paris, he had destroyed 70,000 Hugonets. Some have computed that, from the year 1518 to 1548, 15,000,000 of Protestants perished by war, or were destroyed by the Inquisition! The harlot may well be represented as drunk with the blood of the saints. The spirit of the Papacy is the same to this day, "unchangeable and unchanged," possessing the principles, and grasping at the ancient power of persecution. Many other marks of ANTICHRIST might now be pointed out, but we will only notice one more.

7. The Romish Church in her succession of Popes, Bishops, Priests, and Fraternities, is represented by St. John (Rev. xiii.)

under the similitude of a beast. After describing him at large, the Apostle concludes by saying, "Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred three score and six." That this is applicable to the Papacy, admits not of the slightest doubt. If this mystic number finds its complete exhibition in the Church of Rome, and in her alone, nothing more can be demanded by the most fastidious mind. Let it be carefully noted, that while the Apostle states it to be the number of the beast, including the whole church, he also asserts it to be the number of a man; and hence, it will admit both of a general and particular application—an application to that church, and also to the Pope who is its head. The two things must then combine. To understand this thoroughly, let it be remarked, that the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans, enumerated by letters up to the 10th century, when the notation by figures was introduced. After the division of the empire, the Greeks, and other orientalists, called the Western or Romish Church *Latins*, because they *latinize* in every thing. Mass, prayers, hymns, litanies, canons, decretals, bulls, are all conceived in Latin. This is the authorized language, even of the Scriptures in that church. The Council of Trent debated and published their decrees in Latin; and hence, the Romish Church is emphatically characterised as the Latin Church. The Greek term, Λατεινος, *Lateinos*, contains this number. The Hebrew word, רומיית, *Romuth*, Roman beast, or kingdom, contains it also. This, also, is found in the Greek phrase, ἡ Λατινη Βασιλεια, *he Latine Basileia*, or the Latin kingdom. Here now is the number of the beast; but where is the number of a man? It is found in the title of the Pope—*Vicarius Generalis Dei in terris*—the Vicar General of God upon earth. Thus, in the language of the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans, this mystic name is found; for taking the letters according to the numbers answering to them in the Hebrew and Greek alphabets, and also the letters used as numerals among the Romans, dropping those that are not, the demonstration stands complete as follows:—

ר 200	.....	Λ 30	.....	ἡ 8	.....	V 5	
ו 6	.....	α 1	.....	Λ 30	.....	I 1	
מ 40	.....	τ 300	.....	α 1	.....	C 100	
י 10	.....	ε 5	.....	τ 300	.....	I 1	
י 10	.....	ι 10	.....	ι 10	.....	V 5	
ת 400	.....	ν 50	.....	ν 50	.....	L 50	
——	.....	ο 70	.....	η 8	.....	I 1	
666	.....	ς 200	.....	Β 2	.....	D 500	
		——	.....	α 1	.....	I 1	
		666	.....	σ 200	.....	I 1	
				ι 10	.....	I 1	
				λ 30	.....	——	
				ε 5	.....	666	
				ι 10			
				α 1			
				666			

Section XII.—Mr. Sibthorp's Sophisms.

We are now fully prepared to overturn the babel erected by Mr. Sibthorp. The ground he assumes is this, that the Jewish Church was a typical one—it must, therefore, have its antitype now existing; and this antitype is found in the Church of Rome. As the Jewish Church had its High Priest as a centre of unity—its common priests and Levites—its perpetual sacrifices, and one mode of worship, from one end of Canaan to the other; so, according to Mr. Sibthorp's scheme, these are all found in the Romish Church alone. In proof of the divinity of this view, he quotes the command of Jehovah to Moses, "See that thou make all things according to the pattern showed thee in the mount." In making his application, he shows that Christ gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven to Peter, and the Popes as his successors—that Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, answer to the three orders of priesthood among the Jews—that the sacrifice of the mass demonstrates their priesthood—and that Christ having gone from earth into heaven, left the affairs of his church in the hands of the Popes especially; and thus his present Holiness forms now, as his predecessors did, a centre of unity and complete executive government, to which all men should submit. Hence, in page 15, he says, "It would be incredible that Christ should leave his kingdom in the world without any fixed government, or that government without an essential to all governments—a *supreme executive* and *centre* of *unity*. He instituted this for the Jewish Church, and left it not to accident to set it up, or throw it down." Of course, as the Protestants are divided into various sects, and deny the Pope's authority, he speaks of them all as destitute of unity. A very few reflections will exhibit this scheme as a mere babel full of contradictions, and antichristian in its nature:—

1. If Moses made all things according to the pattern or mind of God, let us ask Mr. Sibthorp if the Church of Rome be so constituted? Let the foregoing sections testify. Has she not departed from the revealed will of God in every thing essential to a true church? Had Moses taken away the second commandment, set up images in the tabernacle, furnished it with the relics of pagans, caused the people to bow down and worship them—had he taught the people to believe the paschal lamb was transubstantiated into Christ himself, forbad the sprinkling of its blood, caused them to worship the lamb before they eat it, and in all this proclaimed himself infallible—there would be good and substantial ground for claiming the Jewish Church as a type of the Popish one. Again, had he concealed the law, cried up traditions, employed Jannes and Jambres to work mock-miracles in support of his authority, gathered the elders in council like that of Trent, caused them to curse to perdition every Jew who would not receive his assumptions, and, finally, made every priest swear to the truth of the falsehood, the analogy would stand complete between the present Church of Rome and the Jewish Church, constituted after this pattern. Mr. Sib-

thorp, therefore, is very unfortunate for so far in the statement he has made.

2. If the Jewish High Priest, Priests and Levites, typified the Romish Hierarchy, I greatly fear there will be inextricable difficulties in making the case apparent; for, 1. If the High Priest was a type of the Pope, and the ordinary Priests and Levites types of the Popish Priests and Deacons, then what will become of the Popish Bishops, who are thus left without any type whatever? 2. If the Popes and Bishops be of one and the same order, it follows, of course, that the Jewish High Priest, and the ordinary priests, were of one and the same order also: the High Priest being a type of the Pope, the others must be types of the Bishops. 3. If this be the case, and the Levites represent the Popish Deacons, it is evident that the poor priests of Rome are thus left without either type or shadow in the economy of the Jewish Priesthood. Mr. S. may take either alternative, as it suits him; for it would now seem that his types are all got into confusion. 4. If the Popish Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, find their types in the High Priests, Priests and Levites, then what will become of his Holiness? for he is thus left without type! Perhaps it may be the best way to refer him to St. John's beast, which rose out of the sea, or St. Paul's Man of Sin sitting in the temple of God, and exalting himself above all that is called God.

3. Mr. Sibthorp is very anxious to prove the Jewish High Priest to have been a type of his Holiness the Pope. But why this anxiety? Because he was an acknowledged type of Christ; and as Christ, according to Mr. S.'s scheme, has given all his affairs into the Pope's hands, it would be a very convenient and satisfactory method of supporting this plan, and of making converts to the Popish Church. The sum of the argument is this: the chief priest of the Jews was a type or figure of Christ, especially in offering sacrifice; the Pope offers the very same sacrifice of Christ in the mass, as the chief priest of the Romish Church; therefore, he was typified by the chief priest of the Jews. Now, that this view is false, blasphemous, and infernal, will appear, by establishing this point, that the sacrifice of the mass is not the sacrifice of Christ; because, 1. It is not the *same thing*. Has that wafer the same nature of Christ? was it born of the Virgin Mary? did it preach the same sermons? work the same miracles? endure the same sufferings? lay down the same life? expire at the age of 33? rise from the dead? ascend to heaven, and "sit down for ever on the right hand of God?" 2. It is not offered at the *same time*. Was it crucified on Good Friday, 1800 years ago, while the sun was darkened from the sixth until the ninth hour? 3. It was not made in the *same place*. Was the wafer crucified in Judea, adjoining Jerusalem, on Calvary, and by being extended on the cross? 4. It was not offered by the *same priest*. Christ is not the Pope, and the Pope is not Christ. He was never a priest of the Church of Rome—never educated for her ministry—never entered into her holy orders—and never, like the Pope, presented sacrifices for

money. Christ can have no successor, because he is neither of the order of Aaron or of the Pope. He is a priest after the order of Melchisedec, says Paul; who stands recorded in the sacred history as an immortal priest, without ancestor or successor. It is expressly asserted, that Christ "hath an unchangeable priesthood"—a priesthood that passeth not from one to another. Mr. S.'s scheme, therefore, would represent Christ as very far away, or unconcerned about his church, or unable to carry on his own affairs; and hence, he put them into the hands of his Holiness to manage for him; and the Pope does this so completely, that he represents Christ as being dead by the lifeless wafer, which he offers as the real Christ; and because he is the priest in this case, he was not only typified by the Jewish High Priest, but is vastly greater than the sacrifice he offers, he possessing life and energy, and it being destitute of both. The Pope being greater, therefore, than the sacrifice he offers, shows that it is not the real Christ; and hence, there is no sacrifice—he is no priest—and, therefore, he could not have been typified by the High Priest of the Jews.

4. Mr. S. asserts, that the Pope is the centre of unity. Undoubtedly he is to the Church of Rome; but not to the Church of Christ. Christ is the head and centre of union to all true believers, of every sect and party. There can be no true unity without diversity. There is a variety in the planetary system combined with unity. A tree has but one stem, and yet it has a variety of branches. Mr. Sibthorp was out in his notions of unity, when he appealed to the Jewish nation; for it was composed of twelve distinct tribes, and yet but one people. All true Protestant Churches have a unity in Christ as the head—a unity of faith in him—a unity of design to serve him—and a unity of spiritual worship. This unity is undisturbed by external modes. What then is the unity of Rome? Why, it is a unity of darkness, ignorance, enmity, and opposition to the truth. It is the unity of a church-yard, where the right of private judgment lies buried. This is an earthly unity; but that of Christ and his church, is heavenly and spiritual. The Pope is the centre of the one—Christ of the other. No man can serve two masters; and as Mr. S. has chosen the Pope as his centre of unity, it is evident he must have let Christ go. May he yet return!

5. Mr. S.'s declaration, that the court of Rome is the "supreme executive" on earth, is a very unfortunate one. It denies Christ's own words, "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." It is antichristian. It denies the divinity of the Son of God. For if he is God, he is present every where. If so, he has no need for such a "supreme executive." That Mr. S. has uttered a great truth is evident in relation to Rome. It has been a "supreme executive," indeed; one that caused crowned heads formerly to kiss the Pope's toe—one that immersed thousands in the cells of an inquisition—an executive that has trampled on the right of private judgment, ground the people of God into dust, robbed Christ of his authority, burned his word, rejected his laws, and usurped his dominion—an executive, which, with an immense police

of priests, jesuits, monks, and friars, enthralled, for many ages, the inhabitants of Europe, trammelled their civil liberty, oppressed the conscience, extinguished the light of science, retarded the progress of improvement, cramped the energies of the intellect, concealed and spurned the divine word, persecuted the followers of Christ, raised tumults in the nations, excommunicated crowned heads, levied an iniquitous tax of Peter-pence, and aspired to the universal government of the world. Here is Mr. Sibthorp's "supreme executive." This is the old, Apostolic government, which he and his brethren, the Puseyites, would again introduce into England! The providence of God, however, has raised up a people, who, though of various names, will never permit ignorance to triumph over knowledge, nor priest-craft to lord it over truth. His mild, pious, and artful attempts, therefore, to bring in the demon of Popery, will not succeed.

In conclusion, I would now appeal to the British people, and especially the operatives of every class who may read these pages. What do you now think of Mr. Sibthorp's creed—of his church—of the change he has made, and of his plausible attempt to lead you into antichristian error? Do you not stamp his conduct with apostacy from the truth as it is in Christ? Is not the fact made as plain as any mind can desire, that he is now a priest of antichrist? Is not the poor man deluded, and therefore he tries to delude others? What do you now say of the Puseyites? They would bring the nation back to Popery; they entered into a conspiracy to effect this purpose, and, by their "Tracts for the Times," have unhinged the minds of many in the land. Have *they* not departed from the faith of the Gospel—from the thirty-nine articles which they have sworn to support? and do they not abide in the national church for the purpose of corrupting it, and use the emolument which she affords towards this very end? They have raised a great outcry about their Apostolical succession, and would thereby either bolster up Popery, or raise themselves into an independent party of Papists without a Pope. I have said but little on this point, as it is handled at large in the Rev. Thomas Powel's masterly treatise on this subject. It is the best book on that subject which has appeared in the English language; and one which sets at defiance the utmost talent, learning, and sophistry of the Puseyite party. It fritters to pieces the Apostolic chain which dangled around the neck of Pope Joan, and leaves its advocates under the necessity of forging a new one, from the materials which decorate the scarlet lady.

WILSON, PRINTER, 70, HIGH-STREET.

THE

FINAL PERSEVERANCE

OF THE

SAINTS ANATOMISED,

BY THE REV. DANIEL M'AFEE.

"Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" Rom. VIII. 35.

"But your iniquities have separated between you and your God." Isa. LIX. 2.

CORK:
PRINTED BY SAMUEL M. THOMPSON,
18, Great George's Street.

1838.

INTRODUCTION.

When two doctrines are directly opposed to each other, it is impossible that both can be the subjects of Revelation—one of them, necessarily being false, must be unscriptural; and if rightly understood, must involve absurdities and contradictions. Still it is manifest, that the false tenet must have something similar to the true one; or, it never could plausibly impose itself on the understanding of a sincere inquirer after truth. When error is embraced by a lover of truth, it occupies the throne of the heart, and reigns as triumphantly and securely as truth itself could, until reason discovers the imposition, and then, it is discarded with the utmost disdain.—No authority, force, or violence however can dislodge it, until facts, scripture, or the spirit of truth dethrone it; and in thousands, even of the children of God, it keeps up its ideal reign, until the bright light of eternity first beams on the departed spirit. The understanding, then becomes as free from error, as the affections were from sin; and. both are fully capacitated to receive the fullness of truth and glory.

But is there any absolute necessity, that we should be subject to error of any kind in this life, while we have the plain and pure revelation of the word of God? Surely not, unless we are carried along in the current of party buoyed up with prejudice and preconceived opinons; and feel inclined to be guided by the dogmas of noted men, rather than submit to the plain, literal declarations of the word of truth.—This word is its own interpreter. It was given to lead men from ignorance into knowlege, from sin to holiness, and from earth to heaven. It reveals nothing merely speculative—nothing that is intended exclusively to enlighten the understanding, without producing experimental or practical results in the heart and life.—Hence it is called by the Apostle, Tit. 1. i. "The *truth* which is *according* to *godlines*." Here is a maxim which can never deceive in its application, or fail to relieve from doubts in difficult cases. Let the conterfeit and the genuine doctrine be cast into this crucible; and the pure metal of truth will soon appear. The opinion which involves mere speculation, is associated with dark, mysterious, and intricate reasonings, and which produces no godly result in the heart or life, cannot possibly be true. The very fact of its lessening motive to inward godliness, and to acts of righteousness, shows it not to be the truth of God; whereas, the doctrine which easily, simply and distinctly in its very nature, and first impression on the mind, excites to watchfulness, prayer, study of the scriptures, and use of the appointed means, *is* and *must be* the "*truth according* to *godliness*." We are now about to investigate two doctrines—the one is the *final* or *infallible perseverance* of the *saints;* and the other, the *possibility* of the *final defection* of *such* from the *grace* of *God*. If the one be true, the other necessarily must be false; and, if the one be "the truth according to godliness," the other must, in its own nature, be incapable of producing godliness, and must have a natural

tendency to sin, rather than holiness.—The fact, of those, who hold the one tenet or the other, being godly persons, and exercising themselves, even zealously in the ways of righteousness, can afford no argument in favour of the tenet in question, inasmuch, as their piety may be traced up to the influence of other truths, associated with the wrong doctrine, and not to the opinion or tenet itself. Falsehood in itself never can lead to truth, holiness, or godliness; it can produce no comfort but a false one; it never did from the commencement of the world—and it never will until the consummation of all things, because it is not in its nature to do so; and hence, when the influence of the Holy Spirit is felt, and when he witnesses to the heart of an individual, that he is a child of God, the testimony is not borne to any wrong doctrine embraced by the person, but simply to the *fact*, that he *now believes* in *Christ*, and that he is *now* the *child of God*. Here is an essential point in experimental religion; and the question to be determined, embraces this view—whether the doctrine of the infallible perseverance of the saints, or the possibility of falling from grace, be more agreeable to the workings of the Holy Spirit in the heart of a believer. It, otherwise resolves itself into this, whether the one tenet, or the other, be the doctrine of the Scripture—the Holy Spirit's own inspiration; for, whichever of these be the true, scriptural doctrine, must receive the sanction of the Spirit of God; and constitute a motive, whereby he works in the soul, and excites the believer to perseverance.

Let us now distinctly ascertain the point to be determined.—It may be briefly stated, thus—Here is a man who has been truly convinced of sin, humbled before God, led to renounce every false way, and to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, with the heart unto righteousness.—He has obtained redemption in his blood, the forgiveness of his sins; and having passed from death into life, "the Spirit itself beareth witness with his Spirit that he is a child of God." Now the question is *not* whether, he *may* persevere unto the end?—whether God is *able* and *willing* to preserve him?—whether he has *sufficient grace provided* and *means furnished* for his perseverance? for all are agreed in this. But the question is simply this, *can* he *never fall finally? Must* he persevere so as to be *finally saved?* or should he *fall* again into *sin*, *grieve* the *spirit* of *God*, and "turn from the holy commandment delivered unto him," *must* he be *restored again*, and be *finally* received into glory? This is the real question, now, to be decided.—It can only be answered by an appeal to the sovereign authority of Scripture.—Without further introduction, let us consider the subject in the following chapters.

THE

FINAL PERSEVERANCE OF THE SAINTS ANATOMISED.

CHAP. I.

EXAMINATION OF TEXTS QUOTED TO PROVE THE DOCTRINE OF THE INFALLIBLE PERSEVERANCE OF THE SAINTS.

I. The first text we notice is Mark xvi. 15. and of course all of a similar import. "He that *believeth* and is baptized *shall be saved.*" Is not this a plain, simple declaration, which asserts, that the believer shall be saved eternally? True indeed! but, it does not assert that, he, who believed yesterday and does not believe to day, shall be eternally saved. It does not declare, that a man, who believes *once*, *must* believe *still*; nor, that, he, who has lost his faith, must be restored again. Hence it is nothing to the point. It simply shows an inseparable connexion between faith and salvation from sin and wrath; but, it does not prove the doctrine, "once in grace always in grace," no more, than it proves that Judas being once given to Christ, he is therefore with him now in glory.

II.—The second Scripture now to be examined is John iii. 36. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life;" hence, it is asserted, that being everlasting it cannot be lost. On this principle the Jews never could break the covenant of God; and yet in Isaiah xxi. 4., it is said, "ye have broken the everlasting covenant." Did not Satan by his sin lose everlasting life? Did not Adam lose everlasting life by his one act of disobedience? If not; then, what did our Lord die to restore? He that believeth on the Son hath the favour, love, and spirit of God, which is called the spirit and the water of life. It implants the root or stamina of everlasting life. This is the true meaning of the text; but it does not mean that the believer has his resurrection body, or the crown or kingdom of life. It does not assert, that a man cannot lose the favour, love, spirit, or life of God. It merely declares that, he that *believeth* hath *everlasting* life; and thereby suspends the continuance of the favour, love

and life of God on the exercise of faith. By faith the life is brought into the soul and by faith it is retained; for "we are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation," or everlasting life—1 Pet. i.5. Hence the question still comes to this, can a believer lose his faith; The text says nothing on the point whether he can or cannot; and therefore, it is nothing to the purpose. Now that a believer, may lose everlasting life, is evident from two cases.

1. That of Hymenæus and Alexander. 1 Tim. i. 19. "War a good warfare, *holding faith* and a *good conscience*, which some *having put away*, concerning *faith* have made *shipwreck*, of whom is Hymenæus and Alexander." Here it is manifest beyond contradiction. 1. That these men had faith or they could not make a wreck of it. 2. This faith was of the right kind; for, it was accompanied with a *good conscience*. 3. They lost this faith or put it away if the apostle speaks truth. 4. They made shipwreck of it and of course could never gather it together again. 5. By losing faith they lost everlasting life, unless it can be proved that men are kept by some other mode than faith unto eternal life. "He that believeth hath everlasting life;" but these men ceased to believe and therefore they ceased to have everlasting life, and the wrath of God rested on them. The apostle testifies this of Alexander. 2 Tim. iv. 14.

2. The case of the church at Sardis. Rev. iii. 2. proves that a believer may lose everlasting life. "Be watchful," saith our Lord "and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die." Everlasting life in itself can never die; but its principle may in the heart of man. Let faith be lost; the title to it is gone; let the spirit of life depart from the heart, and the very nature and influence of everlasting life is lost in the soul. Now that it may die in the soul of man, is evident from our Lord's declaration—"strengthen the things which remain, that are *ready* to *die*." If it never could die, why does he say it could? If he decreed it should never die, why does he assert it was *ready* to do an *impossibility*? If he knew it could never die, why does the author of truth himself, leave the impression on the backsliders of Sardis, that it might? Would not this be to threaten them with a falsehood? and warn them with a lie? Would it not be doing evil on his part that good might result to them? An illustration may set this argument in a stronger light. Our Lord addressed the church of Sardis in the year 96. That was 4100 years from the creation of the world. Now suppose he warned them to prepare for judgment; for the sun is *ready to*

expire, his *light is about* to *die*, when it is evident from the fact he decreed the sun to shine 1741 years longer up to the present time, could this be either true or sincere in him ? But suppose further that he decreed the sun should never expire--that it should never die, could he possibly be sincere in saying to that church, "prepare for judgment for the sun is *ready* to *die* ?" Impossible ! and hence, if he had decreed that the people of Sardis could not fail of everlasting life, he could not in truth declare that the life in them was ready to die. The warning shews the possibility of losing everlasting life, and this is all for which we contend. For if the possibility exist of falling finally away, there can be no absolute decree—no certain number absolutely elected to eternal life. An absolute decree, that *must issue* in everlasting life to all included, prevents all such from being threatened with either loss or punishment, because God is a God of truth and cannot produce such great good by false warnings and empty threatenings.

III. We now examine John iv. 14. "But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him *shall never thirst*," viz. never be *unhappy* or *miserable*. What then do these words prove ? That a man who drinks once of the living water or the Spirit's influence can never be unhappy again ? Surely not ; for many a believer has become very unhappy by losing his faith and the indwelling of the Spirit. Our Lord plainly declares the reason why the believer shall never thirst, because the Spirit shall be "in him, a well of water springing up into everlasting life." His happiness arises from two causes– the abiding influence of the Holy Ghost, who is the efficient cause ; and drinking, or believing, which is the instrumental cause. While the latter is in operation the former must abide ; but if the man lose the faith, or cease drinking, the Spirit departs, unless there be some other mode of retaining the Spirit's influence than faith. The Scripture reveals no other, and hence, as this text does not determine whether a man may cease, or must continue drinking or believing, it is nothing to the point in hand. It simply proves that so long as a man believes, he enjoys the Spirit, and therefore is happy ; but it does not prove that such a one may not forsake the fountain of living waters.

IV. Our next text is John v. 24. "He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation ; but is passed from death unto life." Does this mean, that he, who once believes in Jesus can never fall, because, he can never come into condemnation ? Certainly not ; for the follow-

ing reasons :—1. His hearing and believing are coeval with his enjoyment of life and freedom from condemnation in point of duration ; and hence, if he ceases to hear or believe, he loses the life and and comes again into condemnation. It is in the Greek text literally, he who hearing and believing, which shews the continuation of the action. This is the form in which the action of believing is expressed in many places of the New Testament, and indicates not only the act begun but continued. The meaning of the text therefore is plainly this—that he, *who believes shall not come into condemnation* for his past offences ; but having by his faith *passed from death into life*, he shall enjoy that life continually through the exercise of the same faith which first brought it into the heart. 2. This sense is in accordance with the following scriptures. "The younger widows refuse—having damnation, (or condemnation), because they have *cast off* their *first faith.*" 1 Tim. iv. 11. 12. "For if our heart *condemn* us God is greater than our heart." 1 John iii. 20. " He that believeth not *is condemned* already"—and the wrath of God abideth on him." John iii. 18. 36. It is by faith alone ; and not by *works* on the one hand, nor *abstract decrees* on the other, the soul is freed and kept free from condemnation. Hence the man who has faith now is free now ; and he, who has it not, is now under condemnation, whether he believed once and lost it, or never believed at all. 3. If the man, who merely believed once can never come into condemnation afterwards, then it follows that all his sins, past, present and to come, were forgiven on his first believing ; and of course, whether, he fasts or feasts, breaks the sabbath or keeps it, honours his parents or disregards them, loves or kills his neighbour, lives chastely or commits adultery, acts honestly or steals, speaks truth or bears false witness, continues to believe in Christ or denies him, he is always a pleasant child of God. If so ; let us find fault no longer with Leo the X. for devising indulgences, Tetsel for selling them, or the people of that day for buying them, seeing the example is set by the great author of salvation, with this difference, that the popish ones were sold and the antinomian one is a free gift ! But you justly shrink from this view and cannot believe, that the future sins as well as the past are forgiven. Then you suspend the favour of God on the continued exercise of faith, and hence, this text proves nothing to the point, because it does not determine the question, whether a man may lose his faith or not.

V. We now examine John vi. 39. "And this is the *Father's will* which hath sent me, that of *all* which he *hath given me*, I should *lose nothing* but should *raise* it up *again* at the *last day.*" Let us

read the 40th verse, "and this is the *will* of *him* that sent me, that *every one* which *seeth* the *Son* and *believeth* on *him*, may have *everlasting life*: and I will *raise* him *up* at the *last day*. The latter verse explains the former and shews that believers alone are given to Christ. It is the will of the Father, ver. 39, that none given to the Son should be lost, but be raised up again in the last day; it is his will ver. 40, that all who believe in the Son should enjoy the same blessing; and hence, it follows, that to be given and to believe amount to the same thing. The Father's will therefore is simply this, as in John iii. 16, "that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, (or be lost) but have everlasting life." A *believer* therefore *can never perish;* but an *unbeliever may*. Though it is asserted that it is the *Father's will*, that none given should be lost—yet it does not follow from this but that some given, or some, who once believed may be lost for want of perseverance. That the will of God in this respect is not absolute but conditional, or founded on believing and retaining faith to the end, is plain from the following considerations.

1. It is expressly asserted 2 Pet. iii. 9. "The Lord—is *not willing*, that *any* should *perish*, but that *all* should *come* to *repentance*." Again, St. Paul declares 1 Tim. ii. 3. 4. that "God our Saviour *willeth all* men to be *saved* and to *come* to the *knowledge* of the *truth*." Now as God cannot have two wills but one; it necessarily follows, that if his will be absolute in the one case, it must be so in the other; and if it be unconditional in the one it must be so in the other. If it be his will, that none should perish; and that all should be saved: and yet, we know some perish, it must be by not complying with the terms required and acting contrary to his will; and if it be his will that all, whom he gave to the Son, should be raised to life in the last day; it must be on the condition, that they continue in his hands—that they persevere in believing in him and obeying him; for if they turn away from him, they shall perish also. The words in John vi. 39, do not assert, that all who were once given, or who once believed, shall be raised up to life at the last day; but only, that it is the *Father's will* it should be so; and as his will is conditional, it follows that the event may never take place, because the conditions have not been performed.

2. The case of Judas is as clear a demonstration of this as possibly can be produced. The following facts and particulars concerning him are quite satisfactory to my mind, and will prove so to yours also, if you are led by the word of God and not by preconceived opinions. 1. "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee and manifested forth his glory and his disciples (of whom Judas was one)

believed on him." John ii. 11. Judas was therefore a believer and saw Christ; but "this is the *will* of the *Father*, that every one, which *seeth* the Son and *believeth* on him may have everlasting life"—and yet Judas was lost. 2. "Those that thou *gavest* me I have kept and none (not one) of them is lost, but the Son of perdition." John xvii. 12. Hence Judas was given to Christ, and therefore believed in him and belonged to him. The prodigal Son could not have been lost to his Father, if he never belonged to him; the man, who had the hundred sheep could not have lost one out of the hundred, if he had only ninety-nine at the first; the woman, who lost the piece of silver and found it again, could not have lost it, if she never possessed it; it would be impossible for you to lose a ship at sea, if you never had one, and equally impossible would it have been for our Lord to have lost Judas, if he never was given to him and was not his own peculiar property. Judas was *given* by the *Father* and *received* by the *Son*; and yet Judas was lost! "And this is the *Father's will* which hath sent me, that of *all* which he hath given me I should *lose nothing*." Hence it was not, primarily the will of the Father or of the Son that Judas should be lost; and yet he became the son of perdition! 3. "*All* that the *Father giveth* me, *shall come* to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." John vi, 37. Judas being given, came to Christ, was received, and realised the promise; and yet he was lost. 4. "No man *can come* to me *except* the *Father* which hath sent me *draw* him; and I will raise him up at the last day." John vi. 44. Judas, therefore, was drawn by the Father to the Son with the cords of love and the bands of a man or else he could not have come; and yet he broke those cords and was lost. 5. "Every man that hath heard and hath learned of the Father cometh unto me." ver. 45. Hence Judas was taught of God, learned the lessons of his grace, forsook all to follow Christ, became his disciple in sincerity; and yet betrayed his master, and was lost. 6. Judas was *one* of *Christ's sheep;* for our Lord says, Matt. x. 16. to the twelve, of whom Judas was one; "Behold I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves." And in John x. 29. "My Father which *gave* them me is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." Hence, he was approved of by the great Shepherd, heard his voice, followed him, was secured from all foreign influence; and yet he plucked himself out of the Father's hand and was lost. 7. Judas had *everlasting life* in the scriptural sense established in No. II. This is evident because he believed on the Son, was given by the Father; was drawn, taught, learned, came, was received and became one of Christ's sheep. For our Lord says, "he

that believeth *hath* everlasting life;" and also "my sheep hear my voice, and I know them and they follow me and *I* give unto them *eternal life;* and they *shall never perish;*" and yet Judas was lost; which proves that he ceased to be a believer and lost the distinguishing characteristicks of Christ's sheep; otherwise he could never have perished. 8. Judas was *personally elected* or *chosen* by *Christ himself*—"ye have *not chosen* me; but I have *chosen you.*" "*I have chosen you out* of the *world;* therefore the world hateth you." "Have not *I chosen you twelve?*" "He called unto him his disciples and of them he *chose twelve*, whom also he named apostles." "And Jesus went up into a mountain and calleth unto him whom he would." Here is the testimony of truth itself in reference to Judas. He did not chose Christ in the first instance, but Christ chose him, loved him and delighted in him, in common with the rest of the apostles. He was called and chosen but not faithful. This choice took place after a nights fervent prayer. It was the choice, of him, who is the wisdom of God. "The Lord seeth not as man seeth; for *man looketh* on the *outward appearance;* but the *Lord looketh on* the *heart.*" Sam. xvi. 7. Do we believe this declaration? It is evident then that Judas was as sincere, as honest, as teachable, as humble, as self-denying and as worthy of Christ's choice and confidence as any of the apostles, when he first chose him. Christ must have chosen him, with a good, and not an evil design. Election in scripture always relates to privileges, blessings, and offices, which tend to holiness and heaven, and not to bondage, sin and ruin. Judas, however, made his calling and election void; he became the son of perdition. Had he been a devil, a hypocrite, a thief and a wolf in sheep's clothing, when Christ thus called and chose him; it follows, either, that our Lord did not know the human heart, and therefore, was not Jehovah in our nature; or that, knowing it, he set an evil example to the church in all future ages, so that wicked Kings, governments, Popes and Bishops, may well justify their iniquity in the choice of men to minister in holy things, who were, or are the ministers of sin and Satan. Besides if Christ chose Judas, knowing him to be such a wicked person as some represent him, no man, however worthy, or elevated in the christian ministry, can tell whether he be chosen for the best or worst purposes. 9. As a *fruit* of *Judas' election* to the Apostleship he was *privileged*, in common with the other apostles to understand the mysteries of Christ's teaching. For it was to the twelve, our Lord said, "unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven; but unto them, it is not given." Thus, he was distinguished, not only from the

multitude, who seeing, saw not; and who hearing, heard not; but was also more highly favoured than even the prophets and righteous men, who desired to see and hear the things, which, he saw and heard; but never were so richly blessed. "But blessed are your eyes for they see; and your ears for they hear," said our Lord to the twelve. Matt. viii. Judas at this time, therefore was blessed and not cursed of the Lord. 10. Judas was *ordained* and *received* his *high commission* from Christ, as one of the twelve, to *preach his gospel* and *work miracles*—Read the whole of Matt. x. and mark the several declarations. There you learn that as he had received freely, he was to give freely—that he was to abide in the house and city of the worthy—that his peace was to abide there—that the very dust of his feet was to be a testimony against those, who did not receive him—that he was a sheep (one of Christ's) in the midst of wolves—that the Holy Ghost is called the spirit of his Father—that the very hairs of his head were all numbered—that the receiving of him was the receiving of the Father and the Son; and that, he, who gave him even a cup of cold water, should in no wise lose his reward. We are either constrained, therefore, to believe in the sincerity of Judas or to think the whole commission a forgery; and also conclude, that no man can trust the sincerity of our Lord! 11. Judas had the *promise* of a *throne* and of a *kingdom*. "Verily, I say unto you," saith Jesus, Matt. xix. 28. "That ye which have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of the children of Israel." The twelve had left all to follow Christ. He called them and they obeyed the call. Judas was one of the twelve. Eleven of these realised the promise, Judas did not; and therefore, he must have forfeited the title, which Christ now gave him. To say, "it was never intended for him," is to deny it to the rest. It is not said *they*, but "*ye* who have followed me." Whatever Judas was *then*, Matthias, his successor, Act. i. 26. *must have been* in spirit and qualification, when, the Lord chose him after the disciples prayed and cast lots. *His throne*, *dignity* and *glory belonged first* to *Judas*. If he was then a hypocrite, a thief, and an unbeliever, his successor may have been so also at the time of election. Suppose all the apostles had been such wretched characters at the time our Lord made the promise, could we believe him to have been sincere? Surely not; and if Judas did not then possess all the grace necessary at that time for the promise of such future glory, our Lord must have said eleven thrones instead of twelve. There is no condition expressed, but it is evidently implied, and Judas by a failure in the

performance of what Christ gave him grace to do, let another take his crown, his kingdom and his throne. 12. Judas was *Christ's own familiar friend.* So saith the spirit of prophecy, Ps. xii. 9. "Mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me." These words are expressly applied to Judas by our Lord himself. John xiii. 18. "Mine own familiar friend," The Hebrew, *aish shalumi* is literally—the man of *my peace, reconcilement, tranquility* or *happiness.* Why is Judas so denominated? Because he was, as the other apostles, reconciled to him, enjoyed his peace, and had the *most familiar fellowship* and *intercourse* with the Lord of life and glory. Christ put confidence in him; and as proof of this, he became purse-bearer. Now it comes to this—that either our Lord's character must suffer by making friendship with deceit, and trusting in hypocrisy; or Judas was an honest, sincere, and humble believer in the Son of the living God, when he was constituted one of the twelve. 13. We are not left ignorant on the subject, how Judas *lost* his *call, election, ordination, peace, throne* and *future glory;* it is the express testimony of St. Peter, Acts i. 25., that, he *fell by transgression.* Adam never could have fallen if he never stood; neither could Judas. As he fell by transgression, deviating from the right path, or giving way to sin, so he must have been raised to the dignity of the apostleship—to the prospect of a throne, by *righteousness;* and hence faith, sincerity, and every moral qualification must have accompanied his elevation; or else our Lord, as noted already, must have countenanced, by his own choice, call and example, all the wickedness, covetousness, priestcraft and simony, which have disgraced the church from the earliest ages down to the present time. This would make him the author of popery and the minister of sin with a witness! 14. The *fall* and *punishment* of Judas was the *subject* of *Scripture prophecy.* "And none of them is lost; but the son of perdition, *that* the *Scriptures might be fulfilled.*" What Scriptures? Ps. CIX., especially, these words—"Let his days be few and let another take his bishoprick" or office; also those already quoted, "Mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, who did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me." These Scriptures were written not with the absolute design that Judas should fall in order to fulfil them; but they were written on the simple foresight that he would of his own free, unnecessitated will betray his master. When the apostle asserts, "the law entered *that* the *offence might* abound." Rom. v. 20, he only shews the result, not the design. So it is in reference to Judas. Our Lord predicts his apostacy also, that the other disciples

might believe him to be the searcher of hearts. John viii. 19. If this, or any other Scripture concerning Judas, implies, that, he was decreed to betray the Saviour; then, God was the *author* of *his sin*, *Judas* was *innocent*, and *his punishment arbitrary* and *not merited*. He could have no more guilt, than the nails, which fastened Christ to the cross; or the spear, which, as a passive instrument, pierced his side. Suppose such a decree to exist; examine its several links:—They hang together thus: That Judas should be born and subsist in the world by the power of God and the merits of Jesus Christ—that he should be contemporary with the Son of God—that he should be given to Christ—that he should be drawn, come, and believe upon him—that he should be chosen, ordained and sent out as one of his apostles to preach his gospel and cast out devils—that he should eat, drink, travel and lodge with the Saviour—that Christ should put confidence in him as his *own familiar friend*—that to ensure his fall, he should be made apostolic purse-bearer, become covetous, act the thief, and have a devil, perhaps one that he was decreed to cast out of others—that he should sell Christ, betray him, repent, return the money, hang himself in defiance of the command "thou shalt do no murder," and descend finally into perdition, to be tormented to all eternity for fulfilling a decree, which he could no more resist, than he could stem the rapid waters of Jordan, or chase away the darkness, which veiled the sun at the crucifixion of him, whom, he betrayed! Do you believe in this decree, or in any thing similar? Do you believe Judas could not avoid the evil deed? Then, you believe that God is the author of sin, and of course, that all the heresies and wickedness in the world spring from him. Popery, Mahomedanism, infidelity and Paganism are the ugly offspring of his own decree; and there is no necessity of troubling ourselves in opposing sin or falsehood, since the author, of Judas' sin, is the parent of the whole. The mind, that can admit this doctrine, veiled under any covering; or swallow this pill, gilded over with the most artful sophistry, can surely feel little difficulty, unless it be otherwise decreed, in gulping down transubstantiation, or any error however gross. 15. The apostle in Rom. i. 5, tells us, that by Christ, "we have received grace and apostleship;" but, according to this notion, Christ made an apostle without grace! "What have the wicked to do to declare my statutes?"—saith the Lord, "or who hath required this at their hands?" Christ hath, saith this doctrine; for he ordained a thief, who had a devil to be one of his first christian preachers!

When it is said, "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you

has a devil?" are we to conclude that Judas had a devil when Christ first chose him, though he was following Christ for three years, when these words were uttered? If so; there must be *elect devils* as well as *elect angels*. Here is a new kind of election, with a witness!—a reprobate man, with a reprobate devil within him is chosen and placed on the list of the elect. Who now are the reprobates as a counterpart to this election? Here we are puzzled. The elect angels will scarcely do for an answer. We must free ourselves from this quagmire doctrine of absurdities. The case of Judas stands clear only on this ground;—he was a sincere believer and follower of the Lord Jesus Christ; when first called and chosen, he continued faithful for a time; but by giving way to temptation, "he fell by transgression;" and at the time our Lord spoke, Satan had gained possession of his apostate heart. "Have not I chosen you twelve, conferred grace and apostleship on you, honored you above Moses, the prophets, and my other disciples, and yet one of you, although blessed above all others is fallen in heart and has a devil within." This is our Lord's meaning in the passage before us.

Again, when the evangelist says, John vi. 64. "For Jesus knew from the beginning, who *they were* that *believed not* and who should betray him," there is nothing which contradicts the arguments now advanced in reference to Judas; for this text does not prove, that he was an unbeliever from the beginning. If so; why is his case separated from the unbelievers? The first clause relating to unbelievers is in the plural, the declaration respecting Judas is in the singular. Why this distinction? Because they never believed and Judas did. They could not apostatize from a faith, that never had a being in their hearts; but he did; and proved it by betraying his Lord. His confession, "I have *betrayed* the *innocent blood*," exhibits awful recollections of faith, which actuated him, at a former period. From the fact of Jesus foreknowing, that Judas would betray him, we might be led, if we do not examine the matter narrowly and correctly to conclude, that there was something of design or plan on the part of the Divine Being, that Judas should do so. Such a conclusion would make God the author of sin; and must arise from wrong views of those principles on which the government of God is founded. It springs from goodness, mercy, justice, truth, and holiness in him; and from the nature and relations of created intelligent and free beings. The foreknowledge of future actions is connected with; but is not included in the fundamental principles of his government. Foreknowledge is an inspector, but not a principle of his government of free agents. To found his government on fore-

knowledge, implies a departure from the true principles and leads into wrong views of all his proceedings. Foreknowledge does not make things be as they are; but only finds them so, arising from other causes. Jesus knew from the beginning, that Judas *would* betray him; but, he knew also, that he *might not*. In calling, choosing, and ordaining Judas, he was not guided by the mere abstract knowledge of his future conduct; but by the true principles of his government; and the present qualifications of the individual. As Christ's knowledge of Judas did not constitute him a sincere believer, when, he called him; so his foreknowledge of his fall had no influence on his fault. His sincerity and faith at first did not arise from Christ's knowledge of him; but from his knowledge of Christ; and his hypocrisy and unbelief in the end could not spring from Christ's foreknowledge, but from his losing his experimental knowledge of Christ at the instigation of Satan. So far then, as the government of God and the sin of Judas, or indeed of any one, is concerned, the transaction is the same, as if there were no foreknowledge whatever. But on the other hand, if Jesus foreknew that Judas *must betray* him, as a matter of necessity—that, he could no more avoid doing so, than darkness could avoid being on the face of the deep, before the creation of light, I find it impossible for my reason to free God from being the author of his sin, or Christ from acting insincerely in chosing him to be an apostle and calling him, "my own familiar friend;" and if others possess the capability of reconciling these things to their reason and their faith, it is evident, they are favoured with a distinct faculty, which is not included in that general reason and common sense, that God has distributed to the majority of men! "Blessed are their eyes; for they see no contradiction in absurdities! Being endued with such a blessed gift, it is not marvellous, they should look down with pious contempt on every professor of religion, whom God has not elevated into such clear and distinct views! Men of inferior gifts ought surely to be ranked among the reprobates!

We are now to examine an argument deduced from Luke iv. 25. 26. "Many *widows* were in *Israel* in the days of Elias—but to *none* of them was Elias sent *save* (or *but*) unto *Sarepta*, a city of Sidon, unto a *woman* that was a *widow*. And many *lepers* were in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet, and *none* of them was cleansed *saving* (or *but*) *Naaman* the *Syrian*." Here the particle *save* or *but*, it is asserted, is not *exceptive*, but *adversative*; and hence, when our Lord says, "those thou gave me I have kept, and *none* of them is lost *but* the son of perdition," it places Judas in contrast

with the eleven ; and also, it is argued, that as the widow of Sarepta was not of the widows of Israel and Naaman the Syrian was not of the lepers of Israel, so Judas was not of those that were given to Christ, seeing the forms of expression are the same in both passages. Now, with all due deference to this criticism, I would ask, where is the proof that Judas was not given to Christ? Granting, for the sake of argument, that the particle *but* indicates *contrast* or *opposition* in John xvii. 12, why is it, that Judas and not Cain, Herod, or Caiphas is mentioned by our Lord, when he says, "I have kept those thou gavest me ; and none of them is lost but the son of perdition?" Why is he, rather than any other, contrasted with the eleven? The answer is ready ; his ruin is contrasted with their honour and present happiness, while, it is evident, that being one of the twelve, he might have enjoyed all that they now possess. In fact, there is implied in this case *both* an *exception* and a *contrast.* The fall and unfaithfulness of Judas constitutes the exception ; and his punishment the contrast when compared with their salvation. The same notion is involved in the instances now adduced . The widow of Sarepta was an exception to the class of widows ; and Naaman to that of lepers ; their being gentiles, who received favour and benefit, shews the contrast. To argue, therefore from this form of expression, that Judas was not given to Christ, amounts to the same, in point of good sense, as if, I were to contend, that the widow of Sarepta, being a *gentile*, was therefore *no widow ;* and because the leprous Naaman was a Syrian, therefore he was *no leper!* Or, because Judas was not born in the same town with each and every one of the other apostles, he therefore was not given to Christ ! In conclusion, we may observe, that as Naaman was cleansed by complying with the prophet's command ; so Judas fell by a non-compliance with the commands of Christ : and as the widow of Sarepta was blessed by receiving and entertaining the prophet, so Judas was lost by *not enduring* to the *end.* His case was that of *total apostacy* from the *highest favour*, *faith*, and *privileges.* It demonstrates this fact, that a believer may fall finally ; for if one of the elect was really lost another may. Hence, the whole fabric of absolute election comes tumbling to the ground. If it be the will of God that none should perish, but that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth ; it could not be the will of God himself, that a believer, such as Judas evidently was for a time, should be lost ; and yet, our Lord declares him to be the son of perdition. The will of God is one thing ; the fulfilling his will is another. The text under consideration exhibits this. "For this *is* the *Father's will*—that of all which he hath

given me (and Judas was one) I should lose nothing (and yet he is lost); but should raise it up again at the last day." It is manifest, then, beyond doubt, that Judas perished, not by *fulfilling*; but by *resisting* and *disobeying* the *will* of *God.*

VI. We now come to John x. 27. 29. My sheep *hear my voice*, and *I know* them, and they *follow* me: And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." The characteristicks of Christ's sheep now claim attention. Without this we can come to no conclusion. It is evident: 1. That they *hear Christ's voice;* flee from sin and are guided by his word. 2. They *obey his commandments*—repent, believe in his name, love and fear him; hence he knows or approves of them. 3. They *follow* him—imitate his example in patience, resignation, self-denial and forgiveness of injuries. 4. They are *saved*, ver. 9, from the guilt. and *power* of sin. 5. They *follow not* a stranger nor *approve* of his *voice* ver. 5. In doing so they would depart from Christ. 6. They have Christ's spirit, " For if any man have *not* the *spirit* of *Christ*, he is *none* of *his.*" Rom. viii. 9. 7. They have crucified the flesh. "And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." Gal. v. 24. Such are the marks of Christ's sheep or people. Now, before they heard Christ's voice, obeyed him, followed him, were saved by him, received his spirit, or crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts, were they Christ's sheep? Certainly not; and when any of them depart from Christ, forsake the fold and lose the characteristicks now specified, do such still belong to him? Undoubtedly not; for the marks, being lost, demonstrate, that the relationship between Christ and the soul is dissolved.. The grand point now to be observed is the possession and the retaining of the characteristicks; otherwise, the scriptures are completely set aside, the distinction, between the righteous and the wicked, is obliterated, and the land mark, which divides the kingdom of Christ, from that of Satan, is removed; and the whims of a creed substituted for the revelation of God, while the flood gates of vile antinomianism, are opened to wash away the fruits of christianity.

From this text, it is plain. that no second cause can injure a believer, or separate him from Christ or the Father; but it leaves the matter undetermined, whether, he *may* do this *himself* or not. This point is decided by the following texts. " Behold the *Lord's hand* is *not shortened* that it *cannot save;* neither is his ear heavy that it cannot hear; But *your iniquities* have *separated* between *you* and

your God, and *your sins* have *hid* his *face* from *you.*" Is. LIX. 1. 2. Again, "If you will *fear* the Lord and *serve* him, and *obey his voice*, and not *rebel* against the *commandment* of the Lord, then shall ye—*continue following* the Lord *your God;* But if ye *will not obey* the *voice* of the *Lord*, but *rebel* against the *commandment* of the Lord, then shall the *hand* of the Lord be *against you*, as it was against your fathers." 1 Sam. xii. 14. 15. These scriptures form a comment on the language of our Lord. They shew us that there is no defect in the hand or power of God to save; and decidely prove that sin, iniquity, and unfaithfulness on the part of hrist's sheep, not only plucks them out of his hand, but turns it against them. A sheep, viz. one who retains the nature, dispositions and marks of Christ's followers can not perish; but if these be lost the characteristicks are those of the goat, and as such, he is to be placed on the left hand of Christ.

VII. We proceed to make a remark or two on John xiii. 1. "Having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end." Hence, it is inferred, that whom he loved once, he loves always. If so; then he loved Judas once for he was his own ("*my own* familiar friend") and of course he loves him for ever! He loved Hymeneas and Alexander, for they once had the faith which afterwards they shipwrecked, and therefore, he must love them as well without faith as with it! He loved the Jews once and yet in Hos. ix. 15., we read, "For the *wickedness* of *their doings* I will drive them out my of house, *I will love them no more.*" Again it is written, Heb. x. 38. "If any man draw back, my soul shall have *no pleasure* in *him.*" Further, in 2 Chron. xv. 2. we read, "Hear ye me, Asa, and all Judah and Benjamin; the Lord is with you, while ye be with him; and if ye seek him, he will be found of you; but if ye forsake him, he will forsake you." So spake the spirit of God by the prophet Azariah; but the spirit of antinomianism, teaches another lesson, that whether a man be righteous or wicked, whether he seek God or forsake him, being one of the elect, he remains always a pleasant child and must be loved unto the end. This doctrine contradicts the plainest declarations of scripture, it represents God as loving individuals at the expense of his own perfections, and word; and causes its votaries to mistake the crude pile of election and reprobation, raised on the plains of Geneva, by Calvin, for the temple of truth, which God erected on mount Sion. Christ's loving his own faithful followers to the end of his sufferings and stay among them, is wrested from its natural position and placed as a pillar to support this antinomian fabrick.

VIII. We now notice, Matt. xxiv. 24. "If it *were possible*, they shall deceive the *very elect*." Here, it is taken for granted, that the word *elect* includes a precise, and definite number, who are predestinated to everlasting life; and of course, as they cannot be deceived, they can never finally fall. Examine this view for a moment in the light of Scripture and reason. The mere form of the expression, "if it were possible," does not imply an impossibility. We adduce two instances. "If it be possible," saith Paul, "as much as lieth in you live peaceably with all men." Does this mean, "as much as lieth in you," try and do an impossibility? Again, in Acts xx. 16., we read, that Paul "hasted *if* it *were possible* for him to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost." What a pity, he was unacquainted with the modern doctrines of grace! Had he sat in the Synod of Dort,—heard the debates of the Westminster divines, or were he now privileged to attend a few of the clerical meetings of the present day, he would get his eyes enlightened and learn, *if it were possible*, not to be hasting through various regions to do an impossibility. Little did he know, that it was decreed from all eternity, that he was attempting an impossibility; and that, he might as well have clambered to the moon and attempted to pull down the stars in a cluster, as have tried to be at Jerusalem on the day of Pentcost! But he was ignorant of Calvin's decrees; and hence, his folly in hasting deserves the sympathy of the enlightened, rather than their censure!

According to this doctrine, it is impossible to account for the following solemn warnings. "*Beware* of false Prophets"—Matt. vii. 15. "*Take heed* to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares." Luke xxi. 34. "*Be not deceived.*" 1 Cor. vi. 9. Gal. vi, 7. "Let no man *deceive* you with vain words." Eph. v. 6. "*Beware* lest any man *spoil* you through philosophy and vain deceit." Col. ii. 8. "*Take heed* brethren, lest there be in any of you an *evil heart* of *unbelief* in *departing* from the *living God* —lest any of you be *hardened* through the *deceitfulness* of sin." Heb. iii. 12. 13. "Little children let *no man deceive you*; he that doeth righteousness is righteous even as he is righteous. He that committeth sin is of the devil." 1 John iii. 7. 8. "These things have I written unto you concerning them that *seduce* you." chap. ii. 26. "For they that are such (that *cause divisions* and *offences)* serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches *deceive* the *hearts* of the *simple.*' Rom. vi. 17. 18. Now, if there was neither a danger, nor a possi-

bility of deceiving these elect, why such warnings and admonitions? The elect cannot finally fall or be seduced, and hence all these declarations are to no purpose. We might with equal propriety exhort the sun not to cease shining, the stars not to fall, and the everlasting hills to beware and not drown themselves in the midst of the sea. "Take heed that no man deceive you" saith our Lord ver. 4. of this chapter. He then assigns a reason, ver. 5. "For many shall come in my name, saying I am Christ; and *shall deceive many*"—a plain prophecy that the elect would be seduced; and this is supported by ver. 12. "And because iniquity shall abound the *love* of *many shall wax cold*," which it could not do, had it never been hot; and yet after all, our Lord by this inconsistent doctrine, is made to say, ver. 24, it is impossibie to deceive the elect; whereas, the phrase "if it were possible" relates not to the impossibility of deceiving the elect; but to the ability, craft, and fair speeches of the seducers. In fact, this doctrine represents the whole system of the gospel, as a system of deception, and the devil, who is the most subtile of all beings, as an absolute fool. Let us simplify the matter. Suppose the whole world consists of one million of persons. One half of these are elect; the other reprobate, passed by, or not included in the elect number. To these numbers you cannot add; from them you cannot substract. They are definite and fixed as the pillars of heaven. The minister goes about offering salvation to all –that is, fishing for the elect, and when he has found them, tells them at one time they can never fall—"once in grace always in it," and warning them at another time not to permit the devil to deceive them, at the same time he believes the devil never finally can: and the devil, fool that he is! not believing the doctrine, tries his arts upon the elect above all others, while, he cannot take from the one, nor the minister from the other. Is this system worthy of the wisdom of God? Is it in accordance with the high sincerity of him, "who willeth all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth?" If the elect cannot finally fall, Satan must be a fool; and if a reprobate cannot be saved out of the fixed and determinate number excluded from that of the elect, the system of the Gospel must be an imposition; its ministry a farce; the universality of its declarations and invitations a mockery; and the final day of judgment a piece of solemn pageantry—the mere exhibition of a firm, stern decree made before the foundation of the world.

IX. But does not the Apostle in, Pet. i. 5. expressly declare, "we are kept by the *power* of *God* through *faith* unto *salvation?*" and as his power can never fail, so it is impossible, for a believer to fall away.

That, there can be no *defect* in the power of him, who never grows weary or faint, admits not of the slightest doubt. That, he is able to keep us from falling and present us faultless before his throne, is equally clear from his word. That all, who are kept are indebted to his power for their preservation, is proved from this text; but it tell us we are kept by his power through faith: and as it does not inform us whether the faith itself may be lost or not, of course, it determines nothing in relation to the point in hand. It simply shews us the *agency* and the *instrumentality* of our preservation—the *power* of God and *faith*. The former can never fail; the latter may; and this is proved;—1. From the case of Judas, "those that thou gavest me I have *kept*, and none of these is lost but the son of perdition." There was no defect in Christ's power, but there was in Iscariot's faith. 2. From that of Hymenæs and Alexander, who made "shipwreck of faith." 3. The case of those apostates alluded to Heb. vi. 6. "who crucified the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." 4. The case of those mentioned by Peter, who actually "forgot that they were purged from their old sins," and of whom he declares 2 Pet. ii. 21., "it had been *better* for them *not* to have *known* the *way* of *righteousness*, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them." 5. The final entrance into salvation is suspended on a believer's retaining his faith. The end of the death of Christ was according to the declaration of the apostle in Col. i. 22. 23., "to present you holy and unblameable and unreproveable in his sight; *If* ye *continue* in the *faith* grounded and settled and be *not moved* from the hope of the gospel." Again, "We are made partakers of Christ *if* we *hold* the *beginning* of the *confidence* unto the *end*." Heb. iii. 14. It is by an "evil heart of unbelief," a man "departs from the living God;" and hence the declaration of our Lord, "He that endureth unto the end shall be saved," Matt. xxiv. 13., and also his exhortation, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." Rev. ii. 20.

X. We must now consider 1 John ii. 19. "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us." From this it is contended, that "being of us," means of the elect; and of course, going "out from us," means departing from the elect. If this be a true inference, then what are the results? 1 That those who went out never were true believers. 2. That a true believer never forsakes the communion of the elect: and 3. That as a believer never

can *finally* fall, so from this text, he *cannot fall* at *all*, so as to *renounce christianity*. 4. That any or all who forsake a christian communion at any time, never were of the elect, and of course, never should be brought back. Now this view of the passage is evidently wrong, for it would prove that where a sheep—one of the elect strays from the fold, it should never be brought back, because its forsaking the fold proved that it never belonged to it—it would prove that when Peter forsook his Lord by denying him, he never belonged to him—that Hymenæs and Alexander by forsaking the Church and becoming heretics, never "put away faith and a good conscience," which Paul expressly asserts that they did 1 Tim. i. 19—and it would go to assert in direct opposition to Heb. vi. 4-6., that those "who were once enlightened, who tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come and who fell away, that *they never crucified* the *Son of God afresh*, and *put him* to an *open shame*." Surely such results impel us to look for a more sober and likely meaning of this text.

From other portions of the sacred writings we may easily gather the design and meaning of this. Every one, who denied the divinity —the incarnation and the atoning death of Christ, with justification by faith alone in his blood, is called an Antichrist by St. John. There were many of this class in the primitive Church. Hence the Apostle says "they went out from us," and of course they excited prejudice against the apostles and wrought upon weak minds by professing christianity, while they were its deadliest enemies. Hence we read Acts xv. 24. "Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain *which went out from us* have troubled you with words perverting your souls,—saying, ye must be circumcised and keep the law: to whom we gave no such commandment." In chap. xx. 30. the Apostle Paul says, "Also of *your own selves* shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." These are called false brethren, Gal. ii. 4, false Apostles, 2 Cor. xi. 13, evil workers, Phil. iii. 2. These went out from the christian church in general, and by their forsaking openly the communion of the saints, they shewed that they were not of the same spirit, principles, or practice, and manifested to all men, that had they been actuated by the spirit of truth, they would have continued with the apostles and all of a like mind. In fact, the passage has no reference to the point in question. For, we are not told whether they were once converted or not; and we only know from what is here said, that, when, they renounced christianity, they were destitute of its genuine spirit.

XI. We must now attend to Psalm LXXXIX 30. 34. "If his *children forsake my law* and *walk not* in *my judgments*; if *they* break my statutes and *keep not* my commandments; Then will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. *Nevertheless* my *loving kindness* will I not *utterly take* from *him*, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail." This passage is pressed into the service of Calvin's final perseverance; but with what propriety, it remains yet to be discovered. The Lord *chose* David to be King in Israel ver. 19; he *anointed* him ver. 20; he made a *covenant* with him ver. 3; he *swore* by his holiness that he would not lie unto David ver. 35; but to what does all this relate? To Calvin's elect? Surely not; but to the perpetuity of David's seed and kingdom. This was amply fulfilled in the preservation of the Jews amidst the nations, until the coming of our Lord—in his being born of the seed of David according to the flesh—in his occupying the throne of David, not temporally but spiritually, according to Is. ix. 7. "Upon the *throne* of *David* and upon his kingdom to order and establish it with justice and with judgment from henceforth even for ever." Such is the simple view of the 89th psalm, which has no more relation to the infallible perseverance of the saints, than it has to the discipline of the church at Rome or Corinth. The promise secures the coming of Christ according to David's seed and no other; and hence, though the Jews sinned, forsook the law of God, and kept not his commandments, this did not cause him to alter his covenant and oath to David, while, he punished their transgressions according to their deserts. This passage then has nothing to do with the point under consideration.

XII. But does not Jeremiah the xxxi. 3, prove the point of final perseverance? I answer not. Let us quote the passage in connexion. "At that time saith the Lord, will I be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people. Thus saith the Lord, the people which were left of the sword found grace in the wilderness; even Israel, when I went to cause him to rest. The Lord hath appeared of old unto me, saying, yea, I have loved thee with an everlasting love; therefore with loving kindness have I drawn thee. Again I will build thee and thou shalt be built, O virgin of Israel." On this passage we make the following remarks:—1. It has reference to the restoration of Israel from captivity. 2. It relates to the whole Jewish people as a nation. 3. Love may be *everlasting* in its *own nature;* but not so in *its benefits*. 4. Of this same people God expressly declares Hosea ix. 15. "For the wickedness of their doings I will drive them out of my house, *I will love them no more;* shew-

ing, that they did not *abide* in his *love*, though, it was *everlasting* in its own nature. 5. This passage proves then, that a nation may be loved with an everlasting love and forfeit it ; and hence, fulfil the declaration of the prophet Isaiah. chap. xxiv. 5. " they have broken the *everlasting covenant*." 6. From this we cannot help observing " a fallacy that is constantly used, by almost all writers on this point. They perpetually beg the question by applying to *particular persons*, assertions, or prophecies, which relate *only* to the *Jewish Church* in *general* : and some of them to the Jewish church and nation, as distinguished from all other people." Hence, this practice perpetuated may have contributed its share in assisting our Irish millenarians, to collect the scattered remnants, of the ancient temple, and raise a fanciful one for their new Jerusalem.

XIII. Another scripture, subjected to the same fate of misapplication, now claims attention. " I the Lord change not ; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed." Malachi iii. 6. Let us glance at the state of the Jewish people in this prophets time. They are characterised by ingratitude for past favours, profanation of his altars, weariness of his worship, hollow and unsanctified professions, treachery, sorcery, adultery, false swearing and oppression, with an impudent and brazen faced denial of their crime. Then, comes the declaration. " I the Lord change not"—on which we may observe 1. He is *unchangeable* in his *nature*, *perfections*, *designs*, and *covenant*. 2. He is, therefore, unchangeable in his hatred of sin and love of righteousness ; but, he is also unchangeable in his long suffering ; and, therefore, they were not consumed. 4. The wisdom of God is unchangeable in rewarding the righteous and punishing the wicked in the fittest season ; and therefore, the one is not rewarded, and the other not consumed, until, the proper time arrives. 5. As he had sworn unto David according to number xi. he changes not ; but though the Jews act thus wickedly he spares them, as a remnant to fulfil the promises which he made unto their fathers. Where, then, is infallible perseverance contained in this text ? You answer in this, " that it would be absurd to suppose God to love a man to day and hate him to-morrow, inasmuch, as it would imply inconstancy in God." Examine this point for a moment. That God hates the fallen angels now is evident, and according to this reasoning he must, in order, to be constant in his love or hatred, have hated them before their fall, or if he loved them once, he must love them still. Again, " the Lord hateth the evil doer," saith the Psalmist, and " loveth the righteous ;" but there was a time, that every righteous man was an evil doer ; and hence, according to this divinity,

every man, however righteous, must still be hated of the Lord; because, it would be absurd to suppose that the Lord changes. Such reasoning is absurd; because, it proceeds from an absurd creed—a creed that represents Jehovah more attached to *person* than to *principle*—more in love with *individuality* than with *holy character*. God *loves righteousness* and *hates iniquity;* and hence, as men are changed from one state or character to another, they are objects of his complacent love or holy indignation, while, he remains immutably the same. Thus the sun shines unalterably the same, whether, we walk in his beams or retire into the shade.

XIV. We are now prepared to examine another text, which is often as vainly quoted and wrested from its original intention. "For the gifts and callings of God are without repentance." Rom. xi. 29. Of whom were these words spoken? The preceding verse determines this. "As concerning the gospel, first preached to the Jews and rejected by unbelief, "they are enemies" to God, "for your sakes," or on your account, being dissatisfied and enraged at the admission of the gentiles to equal privileges, proposed by the Apostles through believing; "but as touching the election"—the original and unconditional election of the whole Jewish people to peculiar privileges, "they are beloved for the sake of the fathers," with whom God entered into covenant, to whom the promises were made and confirmed even by oath; and hence, at some future time, on their believing, they are to become the people of God. "For the gifts and callings of God are without repentance," inasmuch, as he never repented of any blessings he bestowed on them, or his having called them to be his peculiar people. Such is the connexion and import of this declaration; but, what has this to do with the final perseverance of the saints, and how does it prove Calvin's infallible perseverance? It is no more in point than several other scriptures already noticed; and furnishes another instance of the impropriety of applying to individuals, what is spoken of the Jewish nation. But suppose, we may abstract it from the context, and apply it to a fallen believer, does it prove that he must be restored? On the same principle Satan and his angels must be restored, because they were once the subjects of his highest and freeest gifts. Did our Lord repent, that he gave the man, the one talent, though, he buried it and was condemned as a wicked servant? Did he repent, that he called Judas and made him an apostle, though, he was betrayed by him? Did he repent, that he forgave Alexander and Hymenæus, though afterward they made shipwreck of the faith? His not repenting, of what he *has done*, is no reason, that, he should either *continue*, or *force*

his *blessing* on those, who, like the Jews, abuse his goodness, by "turning away from the holy commandment delivered unto them;" nor does it afford the slightest ground, that, he must restore them, any more, than it does to prove, that, he must ultimately redeem the man with the one talent, because, he never can repent that he gave it.

XV. Another scripture requires a few remarks. "God hath not *cast away* his people which he *foreknew*." Rom. xi. 2. Hence it is argued—those who do not persevere to the end will be cast off; but those whom he foreknows will persevere. This passage is easily understood. The Apostle, in the ninth chapter, demonstrates the rejection of the Jews, who were once the elect people of God. As they were chosen, not for their righteousness or uprightness, to enjoy the peculiar privileges which God had conferred upon them; but in fulfillment of the oath and covenant which he made with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and afterward confirmed to David; so the Jews fancied, they could not be cast off, on any account, without a violation of this covenant, and the oath which confirmed it. They were truly antinomian in their views, and concluded that being once in favour they could never forfeit it—once the elect of God, they could never be rejected. The Apostle noticed this view and the objections to his reasoning, which it suggested on different occasions. Thus, in chap. iii. 1. 3. and ix. 6. he gives an answer to this objection expressed or implied; and this is his grand object in the eleventh chapter. "I say then, hath God cast away his people?" and thereby violated his covenant with the Jewish fathers? "God forbid," saith the Apostle, and then he gives an instance in himself: "For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham of the tribe of Benjamin."—Here, he shews, that, as the body of the Jewish nation were cast off; and as, he an Israelite of the tribe of Benjamin, was not; there must have been some act, on their part, which violated the Abrahamic covenant; and some act, on his, which complied with its conditions. They rejected the Christ—the promised seed, and sacrifice of the covenant; he embraced the promised seed by faith; and hence, he was not cast off; but remained of the people of God, enjoying the rich benefits and complete fulfilment of the Abrahamic covenant; for Abraham, by that covenant, was to be the father of all that believe, whether, circumcised or not. Then follow the words now in question, "God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew." This is illustrated by two additional instances. 1. The seven thousand men, who faithful to the covenant of God bowed not their knee to Baal, but abhorred idolatry in the days of Elias: and 2. "A remnant according to the election of grace," ver. 5. namely, those

who, like Paul, received by faith the promised seed, and like the 7000, in the days of Elias, bowed not their knee to Jewish prejudices, but availing themselves of the benefits proposed by the grace of God, both to Jew and Gentile, believed in Christ, and by faith became the elect people of God, while, the Jews who followed their own blind and antinomian notions were cast off. Who, then, are the people, whom, he foreknew or fore-approved from the beginning. I answer believers in every age and dispensation—the followers of Abraham's faith, at the time the Apostle wrote this; for when God approved of the faith of Abel, of Enoch, of Noah, of Abraham, or of David in former ages, he thereby foreknew or fore-approved of the faith of their successors to the world's end. That the word *foreknew* has this meaning, now assigned to it, is evident, from the following texts. "You only have *I known* of all the families of the earth." Amos. iii. 2. "And then will I profess unto them I never *knew* you; depart from me ye that work iniquity." Matt. vii. 23. "But he answered and said, to the foolish virgins, "verily Isay unto you I *know* you not." chap. xxv. 2. 3. In these passages, it cannot possibly mean bare perception or knowledge; but approval. The same is its import when our Lord says, "I *know* my sheep," and when the Apostle writes, "The Lord *knoweth* them that are his." In conclusion, we reason thus. No man is approved of God without faith. Without it, it is impossible to please him. The man who has it is approved of God, is one of his people, of his elect. He who has it not is condemned already, and is not approved of God. Paul was not approved of God before he obtained it; therefore, he was not an elect of God until he believed. Hymenæus and Alexander were elect of God while they retained it; but when they put away a good conscience, and made shipwreck of the faith which produced it, they ceased to be the elect of God, and could not be approved of by him; and hence, this text contains nothing in favour of Calvin's perseverance, because it knows nothing of his election. "God *hath not* cast away his people which he foreknew;" but "The Lord will judge his people," saith the Apostle, Heb. x. 30., and then adds, "it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God;" and this is spoken in allusion to the man "who *hath trodden* under *foot* the *Son* of *God*, and *hath counted* the *blood* of the *covenant* where with he *was sanctified* an *unholy thing*, and hath *done despite* to the *spirit* of *grace*." ver. 29. We are, therefore, exhorted, ver. 35. "Cast not away your confidence which hath great recompense of reward." From which, it is evident that while we retain the confidence, God will not cast us away; but, if we cast it away, he will reject us; and

we shall become liable to fall into the hands of the living God. "I keep my body under," saith Paul, "and bring it into subjection: lest by *any means*, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a *cast away*." 1 Cor. ix. 27. What evil means possible could have produced this, if he had been absolutely elected to eternal life? "Lest if by *any means*," saith Paul; by *no means*, saith Calvin, for an elect cannot possibly fall away. And is this the sweet Apostolic doctrine, that Paul brought down from the third heavens? If so; he must have forgotten it when he wrote this passage. No man on earth can reconcile the two things together.

XVI. It remains now to consider Rom. viii. 28-30. "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them that are the called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first born among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified." In these words, the Calvinist finds the strong hold of absolute election, eternal predestination, and infallible perseverance. Take them from the context, and it must be confessed, they appear like a key-stone for the system of horrible decrees. But are we justified in doing or permitting this? Any explanation, which is foreign to the main design of the Apostle, must be false. We must first find out the road he designs to travel—the point he means to prove, before we can journey with him; and when this is found, we are not to follow a new path—a creed or explanation of man's device, however, artfully it may be raised up, and appear like the way in which Paul travels to the new Jerusalem. On examination, this will be found to be the way of holiness and of suffering. Examine the contents of the chapter and this will appear beyond doubt. Having previously demonstrated the doctrine of justification by faith, the insufficiency of the law to justify or sanctify the soul, he points out the fruits, and characteristicks of a justified state, from the commencement of the chapter to ver. 17, in which he says, "And if children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together." Here, he introduces suffering to their notice, for the first time, in the epistle. It is the common lot and appointed portion of the children of God. To endure it with patience and perseverance is part of the condition which they must perform, that they may finally be glorified with Christ. To inspire the mind with joy, patience, and resignation under these sufferings; and completely reconcile every believer

to them, the Apostle enumerates a variety of facts by way of argument. Let us notice these.—The sufferings of this life are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. v. 18.—Every human creature suffers, ver. 19-22.—The Apostles and Jews who received the first fruits of the spirit suffer, ver 23.—Sufferings afford ample room for the exercise of hope and patience, ver. 24. 25.—The help and intercession of the spirit are given under sufferings, ver. 26. 27., and then comes his final argument or fact." "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate, &c." Now, it is manifest from this statement, that any interpretation, of the passage in question, which does not keep the primary design of the Apostle in view, cannot, possibly, be its genuine meaning; and breaking the connected chain of thought leads us astray. Keeping strictly by the Apostles design, let us now proceed to illustrate the text, in its proper connexion. The Apostle saith,

1. "We *know*, that all things work together for good." Now how was this known?" From their knowledge of the perfections of God; especially his wisdom, power, goodness and, love, which incline him as the ruler of the world, to order every thing of a painful character, for the present and eternal good of them that love him, They *knew* it also from their own *experienee* and *observation*, having felt and seen the salutary effects of trials, troubles, and persecutions in themselves and others. But they *knew* it, *especially*, by what is recorded of those, who loved God in the ancient times. The history of many such is briefly enumerated in Heb. xi. They had these facts before their eyes in the divine word; and concluding that God is unchangeable and faithful, he must, therefore, be the same to those who love him under the new Testament, that he was to those who loved him under the old.

2. The phrase, "to those who are the called according to his purpose," is explanatory of, or equivalent to the phrase, "to them that love God." This is evident from the mere reading of the passage. "And we know that all things work together for good;" To whom? "to *them* that *love God*—to *them* that are *the called* according to his purpose." Examine this phrase—the called; and let us find out its primary design here. "By faith Abraham when he was *called*—obeyed." Heb. xi. 8. "When Israel was a child then I loved him and called my son out of Egypt." Hos. xi. 1. "Hearken unto me O Jacob and Israel my called." Is. xlviii. 12. "Among whom are ye also *the called* of Jesus Christ—*called* to be *saints*."

Rom. i. 6. 7. "God is faithful by whom ye were *called* into the *fellowship* of his *son*." 1. Cor. i. 9. "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that *called* you." Gal. 1. 6. "For brethren ye have been called unto *liberty*." v. 13. "I — beseech you that ye *walk worthy* of the vocation wherewith ye *are called*, with all *lowliness* and *meekness*." Eph. iv. 1. 2. "And let the peace of God rule in your heart to the which ye are *called* in one body." Col. iii. 15. "That ye would walk worthy of God, who hath *called* you unto his *kingdom* and *glory*." 1 Thes. ii. 12. "God has not *called* us unto *uncleanness*, but unto *holiness*, iv. 7. "Who hath *sared* us and *called* us with an *holy calling*. 1 Tim. i. 9. "But as he which hath *called* you is *holy*, so be ye *holy* in *all manner* of *conversation*." 1 Pet. i. 15. "That ye should shew forth the praises of him, who hath *called* you out of *darkness* into his *marvellous light*. ii. 9. From these texts, we learn the nature and design of this calling, or invitation of God. We see that Abraham, Israel, and the children of God, in all ages, are said to be called. The providence, word, spirit, and messengers of God, all, unite in this calling. They are called from darkness into light, from sin into holiness, from bondage into liberty, from the fellowship of sinners into that of saints and of God's dear Son, from misery into peace and happiness, from pride and anger into humility and meekness; and from their vain and obscene conversation, into that, which is holy and becoming the gospel of Christ. This was his original purpose or plan, when, he first called Abraham; and it is his plan or purpose still; but, there is something more than all this included in this purpose. All these things are *implied* when the Apostle says, "all things work together for good to *them* that *love God*, to them that are *the called* according to his purpose;" but the main point is not *exhibited* in any of those texts now quoted. His design is to fortify the believers at Rome against sufferings; and that they should suffer, by his permission and appointment must be part of his purpose or plan. But is this revealed? Undoubtedly it is. Take for proof the following declaration. "If so be that we suffer with him that we may be also glorified together." This is the very point, he wishes to prove, when speaking of his purpose; But the thing is literally declared. "For what glory is it, if, when ye be *buffetted* for *your faults*, ye shall take it *patiently*? but if when ye *do well*, and *suffer* for it, ye take it *patiently*, this is *acceptable* to *God*. For *hereunto* were ye *called*," that is to *suffer wrongfully* and *bear* it with *patience* and *meekness*: "because *Christ* also *suffered* for us, *leaving* us an *example* that *ye* should *follow* his *steps*." 1 Pet. ii. 20. 21. "For it is

better *if* the *will* of *God* be so, that ye *suffer* for *well-doing*." iii. 17. "But rejoice inasmuch as ye are *partakers* of *Christ sufferings*; that, when his *glory* shall be *revealed*, ye may be glad also with *exceeding joy*. If ye be *reproached* for the *name* of *Christ*, *happy* are ye; for the *spirit* of *glory* and of *God resteth upon you*—yet if any man *suffer* as a christian, let him *not* be *ashamed*; but let him *glorify God* on this behalf." iv. 13. 14. 16. Thus the Apostles "rejoiced because they were *counted worthy to suffer shame* for *his* name." Acts iv. 41. "But the God of all grace, who hath *called* us unto his *eternal glory* by Christ Jesus, after that ye have *suffered* a *while* make you *perfect*, *stablish*, *strengthen* you." Pet. v. 10. Thus, the cross is connected with the crown; self-denial, patience, resignation, and meekness with eternal glory; and to sufferings, trials or privations, which require the exercise of these graces, have the lovers of God been called in every age of the world. Hence, when the Apostle says, "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose," the primary meaning of this expression here, is, that they were called according to his purpose, design or plan to suffer—that every grace, in the probationary state, might be brought into exercise, as preparatory to eternal glory. In this view, we observe the connexion which subsists between this and ver. 26. "Likewise the spirit also helpeth our infirmities, &c."

3. The 29th and 30th verses are advanced, as proof of the 28th ver., and afford an easy, natural, and strong argument, derived from the well known history, of those, who had hitherto suffered from the first developement of the plan or purpose of God. "For whom he *did fore-know*," or *fore-approve* from the beginning, and thereby acknowledged as his own, as the good shepherd knows or approves of his sheep, they *being lovers* of *God*; "he also did *predestinate*,"—did then *determine*, *define*, *trace out*, *decree*, *ordain*, or *appoint* "to *be conformed* to the *image* of his *Son*"—to a life of self-denial, trial and sufferings—"to be partakers of the sufferings of Christ;" and on their continuing to exercise the graces peculiar to suffering holiness, he appointed them to the conformity and enjoyment of his image in glory, "that he might be the first born among many brethren," who had suffered and patiently endured, so as to obtain the promise. "Moreover whom he did (thus) *predestinate*," according to his *purpose*, that they should suffer; "them," in the order of his wise and holy providence, "he also *called*" to suffer; such as Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Job, Moses, David, Daniel and Stephen: "and whom he *justified*," acquitted, approved, or commended, as he did Abra-

ham, for instance, on his offering up Isaac: "and whom," he (thus) justified," on their being faithful unto death, Rev. ii. 10. "them he also *glorified*," by bestowing the crown of life, as he did to Stephen, "who being full of the Holy Ghost, (the spirit of glory and of God which rested on him) looked up steadfastly into heaven and saw the *glory* of *God*, and Jesus standing at the *right hand* of *God*." Acts. vii. 55,—that he "might be glorified together with him."

4. This exposition of the passage is confirmed by the following remarks:—1. No other explanation agrees fully with the Apostle's design. 2. His conclusion from the whole is quite in unison with this view. "What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us,' (as he has been from the beginning), who can be against us?" Shall we fear the world, the devil, or all his instruments of suffering and cruelty, seeing God designed us to suffer and support us under every trial? "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth?" Here the term justify is evidently connected with, and opposed to the charges and condemnation of the world, and used by him in the same sense that we have given to it in the exposition. 3. As it has been shewn that believers are *called* to suffer, so the Apostle expressly asserts, that to sufferings they were appointed. "That *no man* should be *moved* by these *afflictions*; for you *yourselves know* that we are *appointed thereunto*." 1. Thes. iii. 3; hence the predestination to be conformed to the image of his son, relates to his image in sufferings. 4. This is further confirmed by the following declaration, "That I may know him and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made *conformable* to his death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Phil. iii. 10. 11. Here, the word implying conformity is the same as in Rom. viii. 29; "the fellowship of his sufferings and a conformity to his death," imply the same as being conformed to the image of his Son." In addition to this, we may observe, that when Christ appears as the first born among many brethren in glory, Rev. vii. 14. they are spoken of, as "having come through great tribulation," to be led by him as their shepherd and elder brother to living fountains of waters.

5. The doctrine of Calvin, therefore, receives no countenance from Rom. viii. 28-30. He asserts in his Institutes, "that God foreknows nothing but what he has decreed." Taking the term foreknow, in the ordinary acceptation of simple prescience, this sentiment directly contradicts the Apostle. Decrees are first in Calvin's creed; prescience or foreknowledge first in that of the Apostle. Decrees made without prescience must be dark, arbitrary and tyrannical; but de-

crees founded upon foreknowledge in its simple acceptation, spring from wisdom, descrimination, and a due regard to the qualities and nature of those subjects, which constitute the objects of the decree. If decrees relate to persons as such, the prescience of God has no more respect to the elect, than to the reprobate, seeing all are equally foreseen as possessing existence, and the same, identical, corrupt, and fallen nature. Understanding the term, therefore, in this sense, it would bring us to the same conclusion, that the objects foreknown must be not merely persons existing; but persons sustaining a character, distinguished by faith and love, as described by the Apostle, when, he says, "We know that all things work together for good to them that *love God.*" Granting for the sake of argument, that Calvinism is true, and that the Apostle asserts in this passage, that a *certain, definite*, and *distinct number* of *men were predestinated* to *life*, without any foresight either of faith or of works; let us look at the results to which this must lead. So far as the elect are concerned they must be merely passive—inert in will, like a piece of matter, lest they should resist the decree. The fiction of "effectual calling," must be added to the simple calling of the gospel already stated. They must be called, by a calling, which they cannot resist, be justified by a faith, which they cannot but exercise, and be glorified as a reward for sufferings and actions, which they could no more help enduring, or performing, than a rock can resist the wave, a tree forbear growing, or a water mill cease from grinding, when it is supplied by a mountain flood! This doctrine cannot be true; for it contradicts the first principles of onr nature, and necessarily deprives man of free agency; and hence, of accountability.

As it regards the reprobates—the non-elect—the number passed bye—the *certain*, *definite*, and *distinct number not predestinated* to *life*, What shall we say of them? Why truly, that, they being *more highly favoured* than the *elect*, as *intelligent beings* possessing a *free will* to *reject* what they had *no power* to *embrace*—they *resisted* a *call* which the *spirit* did *not help them* to *obey*, and *neglected* a *justification* which they had *no faith* to *receive*, and they *failed* of *obtaining* a *glorification*, for which they could neither *strive*, *labour*, *suffer*, or *exercise grace*, simply because it *was never given* by him who had "the residue of the spirit;" and after *being mocked* with an *ineffectual call*, *tantalized* by an *offer* of *pardon*, and called on to *exercise* a *faith* which they *could no more command*, than they *could create a world;* and after being *sincerely* and *earnestly invited*, to a *kingdom*, which they *could no more enter*, than they could mount the sun and travel round the globe, they are damned to all eternity, for not doing an impossibility, "to the praise of the glorious justice of

God!!!" And this is Calvinism! plain, unvarnished, unsophisticated Calvinism! A thousand colourings may be put upon it; it may be dressed in Joseph's coat, or Esau's skin of hair. Philosophy may create an atmosphere, clouds, and darkness through which to view it; but in spite of all ingenuity, it comes to this in the end, and stands before the eye of reason,

> —"A monster of such frightful mien,
> Which to be hated needs but to be seen."

In conclusion, it is only necessary to observe, that as Rom. viii. 28-30, does not contain Calvin's elect, it is not fraught with his infallible perseverance of the saints; and of course, it does not prove that a believer may not fall and perish everlastingly.

XVII. The last scripture which we shall notice as quoted in defence of Calvinistic perseverance is Rom. viii. 38. 39. "For I am persuaded, that neither *death*, nor *life*, nor *angels*, nor *principalities*, nor *powers*, nor *things present*, nor *things to come*, nor *height*, nor *depth*, nor *any other creature*, shall be *able* to *separate* us from the *love* of *God*, which is *in Christ Jesus our Lord*." This is the result of Paul's conclusion from the preceding reasoning respecting sufferings. It contains a glorious truth—that no *second cause*, whether *good* or *evil*, can separate a believer from the love of God in Christ Jesus. It is immaterial, whether, we understand the love of God, in Christ Jesus, manifested to us, or this love dwelling in us; or whether, we consider the Apostle as indicating both; it amounts to the same thing. But while no *second cause*, can; it does not follow from this, that the *believer* is *incapable* of *doing so himself*. This is the point now which demands attention. That the believer may separate himself from this love, is evident from the whole tenor of scripture—from its promises being suspended on conditions; its commands addressed to free agents; from its motives, exhortations, warnings, and threatenings to excite to perseverance. In fact, the question ultimately resolves itself into this; Is the believer capable of sinning by omitting duty, or violating the commands of God? If the question be answered in the negative; then, no believer can fall—once in grace, always in it; but if it must be answered in the affirmative; then, farewell to infallible perseverance; for sin is the only evil which can, and which does separate any intelligent creature from God. Sin is not included in the above list enumerated by the Apostle, that *cannot separate* the *believer* from the *love* of *God* in *Christ Jesus*. It is not ranked among his creatures because he is not its creator or author. It is the alone work of free agency—the spontaneous production of free will. While, man is in a state of pro-

bation, he must be capable of committing it, else his probation is already past. Thus, we read by the prophet, "Behold the Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save, neither is his ear heavy, that it cannot hear; But your *iniquities* have *separated* between *you* and *your God*, and your sins have hid his face from you that he will not hear." Is, lix. 1. 2. This shews that sin can do what neither death nor life, &c. nor any creature could perform. Again, to these very Romans, he speaks in chap. xi. "Well; *because* of *unbelief* they *were broken off*, and *thou standest* by *faith*. Be not *high minded* but *fear*. For if God *spared not* the *natural branches*, take heed lest he also *spare not thee*. Behold therefore the *goodness* and *severity* of God; on them which fell severity; but *toward* thee *goodness*, if thou *continue* in *his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off*, ver. 20-22. Now, if it was absolutely impossible for them to be cut off, and if the Apostle, by writing, "I am persuaded that neither life, nor death, &c. can separate us from the love of God," brought them to the conclusion, that they could not by any means whatever finally fall; why does he disturb them in this comfortable inference, by plainly informing them to this effect—that as they stand by faith, there was a danger of departing from his goodness by unbelief and high mindedness? The reason is this; the Apostle taught no such doctrine in Rom. viii. 38. 39, nor did they understand his teaching to this effect, no more than I do. Calvinian perseverance, therefore, is not contained in this passage, nor in any other portion of God's word. We have now examined every passage of note, that is generally quoted to prove this doctrine; it remains, therefore, with the candid reader to judge and say, whether, any, or all of these prove it. If it be not contained in any of the foregoing, it cannot be found in any other. Let the man produce his strong arguments who can. Metaphysical speculations and mere sophisms will not avail. The doctrine is unscriptural and false. The preaching of it can do no good; and it never will. It leads to antinomianism, as naturally, as a river does to the ocean. No ingenuity can turn its course, or direct it into a holy channel. It still comes to this in the end; the elect must be saved, do what they may, and the reprobates must be damned do what they can. It is contrary to the "truth according to godliness," because, it furnishes no motive to perseverance; and destroys in its tendency, those, that the scriptures furnish. If it be not found in the Bible, its opposite must; and to prove this, will be our task in the next chapter.

CHAPTER. II.

Scriptures and arguments which prove the possibility of a believer falling finally from the grace of God.

Having considered, in the previous chapter, the various scriptures generally quoted in favour of final perseverance in the Calvinistic sense; we now proceed to investigate those, which, either, directly assert, or necessarily imply the possibility of a man possessing grace, losing it, and hence, perishing for ever. It is well known, that those who hold "the doctrines of grace" so called, generally believe, that any one possessing a true spark of "saving grace," can never lose it; it must ultimately grow to maturity, and finally terminate in glory. This is quite consistent; for if the smallest degree of genuine "saving grace," so termed, may be lost; on the same principle, the highest degree may be forfeited; and hence, its possessor may not only fall foully, but finally. The distinction, between "common" and "saving grace," is one unknown in the scriptures, being the mere invention of men, who, when, they cannot find a bulwark in Divine truth, behind which to screen peculiarities, erect the artificial battery of "common grace," and a "common call;" and retiring under this cover, fancy themselves invulnerable, like the woodcock, which hiding its head in the bramble, acts, as if its body were not seen. As there is but one God—one mediator, and one Holy Spirit; so there is but one kind of grace,—one salvation—and one everlasting life. True indeed! there are degrees in the grace of God; but, the least degree of it must be saving in its nature; and it will save, unless resisted by those, to whom it is offered, or given. Whatever, Christ purchased, or his spirit bestows, must be genuine in its own kind. There is nothing fictitious, or counterfeit in nature; and in redemption every thing must be, especially, stamped with reality. To lose the lowest degree of grace is presumptive proof, at least, that the highest degree may be lost also; and hence, we are now prepared to prove, that grace may be received and lost in various degrees. This is evident.

I. From those scriptures, which prove the *universality* of *grace* in its *communications*, *operations*, and *offers*. Let us quote a few of these. "In him was life, and the life was the *light* of *men*." John

i. 4. Hence, the light is the common property of all men, without distinction, or exception. "And the *light shineth* in darkness"—in the *ignorant* mind of man;" and the *darkness* comprehended it not;" viz., did not fully receive, or embrace that grace, which was as free as the light or air, ver. 5. "That was the *true light*, which *enlighteneth every man* that *cometh into* the *world*." ver. 9. This may be called common grace; but the Apostle calls it the *true light*, because, it is the genuine offspring of truth, wisdom, and goodness. But, what are the benefits of this true light to the whole race of mankind? I answer; a knowledge of good and evil, a seed of truth in the understanding, an approval of that which is right, a capability of choosing it, a power to resist temptation, a desire after God, the chief good: yea, all the honesty, truth, amiability, kindness, and good will to be found in any, or every man, "whether, he dwells at Indus or the pole," are to be traced to this in every age, and among every people. Either, this must be granted at once, or the conclusion is inevitable—that man did not originally lose the *entire image* of God—that he lost it only in part, or that the scheme of Dr. John Taylor is true—that the mind of man in infancy, is equally indifferent to vice or virtue, being born like a sheet of clean paper, capable of receiving good, or bad impressions. Here is a difficulty from which Calvinism never can extricate itself. For, if the universality of this light be denied; then, it drops into Socinianism; and if, it be acknowledged; then, every man has initial grace; and all, who are lost, are backsliders from a degree of grace, by not improving and following, "that true light, which, lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

The same doctrine is fully taught in the following texts. "We trust in the living God, who is the *Saviour* of *all men*, especially of those that believe." I Tim. iv. 10. "For the *grace* of *God* that *bringeth salvation*, hath appeared to *all men*." Titus ii. 11. Or as the margin reads; "the grace of God that *bringeth salvation* to *all men*, hath appeared." Again, "the bread of God, is he which cometh down from heaven, and *giveth life* unto the *world*." John vi. 33. And again, "Therefore, as by the *offence* of *one* judgment came upon *all men* to *condemnation*: even so by the *righteousness* of *one*, the free gift came *upon all men* unto *justification* of *life*. For as by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Rom. v. 18. 19: and hence, the Apostle concludes, "That as sin *hath reigned* unto *death*, *even so might grace reign* through righteousness, unto eternal life." ver. 21. Now, from these scriptures, it follows,

beyond contradiction.—That, in some respect or other, Christ is *actually* the *Saviour* of *every man*. 2. That, this salvation consists in *liberating every man* from the *condemnation* entailed by the *first sin* of Adam; and in confering a degree of spiritual life: and 3. That this *life*, *light*, or *grace*, *actually might reign* in *every man*, unto *eternal life*. The Apostle's conclusion of Rom. v., indubitably leads to this; for, while, he states, that *sin hath reigned;* he expressly declares, "that *grace might reign*," in the same number, and to the same extent. Every man, therefore, is a participator of true, "saving grace," at one time or other; and therefore, it must be resisted, despised, neglected, or not improved by those that perish; so that all, who are lost, truly fall from and forfeit that grace, which accompanies this common salvation. Hence, there never was, nor can there possibly be in the world, such a race as Calvin's reprobates; for having no true grace, they would be but incarnate fiends.

II. "That grace, once received, may be lost for ever, is demonstrated by the parable of the talents, in Matt. xxv. There, we read that to "*one* he gave *five talents* to *another two*, and to *another one;* to *every man* according to his *several ability*," or capacity to receive. By the talents, here, we may understand abilities, natural or acquired, health, strength, long life, understanding, judgment, memory, learning, knowledge, eloquence, influence, wealth, privileges, civil or religious offices, gifts or endowments conferred to a spiritual end, or whatsoever, we may conclude is valuable; but, there is one thing, necessarily implied, as the root and vital influence of the whole; namely, the *grace*, or *peculiar favour* of *God*. Any, or all of these things, abstracted from grace, could not be the subject of praise or blame, in reference to improvement for eternity. One is made ruler over ten cities; another over five; why? because, he has improved the grace; another is cast off as an unprofitable servant, banished into outer darkness, where, there is weeping and gnashing of teeth; why? because, he has not improved a talent for poetry, music, &c.; no; but, because, he has not improved the grace given —the true light, and the initial salvation bestowed. Whatever is meant by the five, or the two talents; the one must be the same. If the five talents be gold; the one talent must be the same. If the five be natural endowments; the one must be the same. If the five signify grace; the one must be the same; and if the one talent mean common grace—false coin; the five, or the two must signify the same; and hence, one man is saved for trading in this common grace, or false coin; and another is damned,

because, like an honest man, he buried it in the earth, and would not put it into circulation! Where, was his sloth or wickedness for not trading in base coin, or common, ineffectual grace? You, on this principle, may see the justice of his damnation; I cannot, if he had only what is called common grace. I believe that he had real, true, genuine grace sufficient to save his soul; and that by not using the power he had, he was justly condemned in the end. If so; I must conclude, in opposition to the logic of Calvin—that, he lost his grace by non-improvement; and that, he became a damned spirit; not because, he never had a talent of grace; but because, he backslided, or fell away from what, he already possessed. "Take, therefore, the talent from him, and give it unto him which hath ten talents;" a plain proof, that the grace was the same in each—in him who is saved, and in him who is lost; otherwise, the man with ten talents could not be much enriched, by having base metal, mixed with the true.

III. That grace may be forfeited, in a higher state of enjoyment, than, that of initial grace, is proved from Matt. xviii. 23, &c. There we read, that, the kingdom of heaven, is likened unto a certain King, which would take account of his servants—One of these owed him ten thousand talents, amounting at least, to two millions sterling—He intercedes, however; his supplication is heard—"the Lord of that servant had *compassion* on him, and *loosed* him, and *forgave* him the *debt*." But, what is his conduct in return? Hard-heartedness and cruelty to his fellow servant, who owed him only one hundred Roman pence, amounting to a few pounds. He listens not to his cry of distress, "but went and cast him into prison till he should pay the debt." This is reported to his Lord—the King, who "called him, and said unto him, O thou *wicked servant*, I *forgave thee all that debt*, because thou *desirest me:* Shouldst not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow servant, *even* as *I* had *pity* on *thee?*" "His Lord was wroth and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him"—a thing impossible for him ever to do. Our Lord's conclusion is, "so likewise shall my heavenly Father do also to you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses." True! this is a parable; but, a parable represents things as they are, or as they might be; it is a similitude taken from common and well known affairs to represent spiritual and divine things. According to the parable; a *man* is forgiven, the *pardon* is *retracted*, *wrath falls* on the *individual;* and he is *given over* to *perpetual punishment*. According to the application; our heavenly Father will act in the very same manner to every

christian, who continues in an unforgiving spirit. This passage demonstrates, that pardon in this life is not absolute—that it is suspended on the exercise of christian temper and proper conduct—and that, he, who loses the gentle and forgiving mind of Christ, forfeits his pardon, subjects himself to wrath, and to everlasting punishment. In fact, it proves all that I contend for—the *possibility* of *forfeiting* the *divine favour* for *ever*, even *after* we *have received* the *full remission* of *sin*. The man, who thinks otherwise, may prove it if he can; and represent the Lord of Wisdom, as speaking parables, to illustrate impossibilities! For, if a believer *cannot* fall finally; then, our Lord spoke this parable to illustrate a case, and warn of a danger which can never occur. According to the eternal decree, an elect never could forfeit his pardon; according to this parable, he could; but as the decree is Calvin's and the parable our Lord's, we will abide by the latter, and let the former go.

IV. In connexion with this, we may now notice another parable. "I am the *true* vine and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away.—I am the vine, ye are the branches:—*If* a *man abide not in me*, he is *cast forth* as a *branch*, and is *withered;* and men *gather them*, and *cast them* into the *fire*, and they *are burned*. If ye abide in me and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you. If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love." John xv. 1-10. Let us, here, observe the various thoughts, which, our Lord in succession, presents to the mind. *I am the vine* possessing the *life* and *vitality* of the *spirit*, which produces love, peace, holiness, and happiness. 2. *Ye are the branches*, united by a *true* and *living faith*, which derives life, love, holiness, and every fruit of righteousness from him. 3. As a man *abides* by *faith;* so he, that *abides not*, *loses* his *faith*, and "departs from him by an evil heart of unbelief." Heb. iii. 12. 4. *He is* (then) *cast forth as a branch*, *separated* from *Christ* by the *act* or *will* of the *Father*, who is the husbandman. 5. He is not only *cast forth*, but becomes *withered*, in comfort, hopes, devotion, profession and fruit; and being withered, *cannot* be *grafted* in *again*. 9. He is finally *cast* into the *fire* and *is burned*, or literally *is burning* in the fire, which, while it preys continually, never can destroy. Such is the gradation of thought produced by this parable. In it, we trace a man, separating himself from the very root of life, until eternal death passes upon him; and he is finally cast into hell itself. "But he was only a branch in profession or in appearance." On the same principle, those, who abode in Christ, were only branches in profession or appearance;

for our Lord makes no such distinction. But, you say, "those who are truly in him never can be separated from him; for being once in grace they must always abide in it." Now, what is the result of this? That the husband-man separated branches from the vine that never were in it; "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away."—That an unbeliever, a hypocrite, could be a branch of the true vine, though, he never belonged to it —That a branch can wither, that never had any juice, or sap in it; viz., that a branch *always withered* can *wither again*, by being cast out from a vine in which it was never grafted—That though a believer abides not in Christ's words, keeps not his commandments, but "turns from the holy commandment delivered unto him," loses the life and fruits of the spirit, and becomes withered and dead, yet, he cannot be cut off, he is still a pleasant fruitful branch, by imputation; and while, the Father cuts off the branches from the son, that never were in him, he imputes the fruit of the root to this withered branch, spares and cuts him off by imputation, in direct opposition, to the office of the husbandman, which is to lop off every branch, that beareth not fruit! What a mass of absurdities and contradictions are engendered by Calvin's doctrine of final perseverance.

V. The parable of the sower recorded, Matt. xiii. Mark iv. and Luke viii. proves the same point. "The seed is the word of God. Those, by the way-side, are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved." Hence, the class of hearers, indicated by the way-side, did not believe for want of consideration; and, therefore, were not saved. "They on the rock, are they, which, when they hear, receive the word with joy; and these have no root, which for a while believe and in time of temptation fall away." Mark says, they "endure but for a time." Now, it is manifest from this: 1. That, the devil did not pick up the good seed at the commencement, out of the hearts of the latter class, as he did, out of those of the former. 2. That, they received the word with delight, saw its beauty and sufficiency to the salvation of their souls. 3. That they believed the word, so as to be saved; and hence, are distinguished from the thoughtless hearers by the way-side. 4. That they endured temptation, persecution, and trials, for a *while*. 5. That, they *fell away* from their faith, joy, salvation, and the duties which the word demand. Such were the stony ground hearers. They enjoyed the comforts of religion for a while; but not persevering in prayer and the use of the appointed means, they became offended

with the cross, and turned from God, into forgetfulness of his word. The sower, the seed, and the faith, are the same in all; but, all did not use the same cultivation; and hence, they not only fell, but fell away; and became so hard, and destitute of the moisture and unction of the spirit by their own neglect, that ultimately, it becomes "impossible to renew them again unto repentance." Calvinism may put what gloss it pleases on this parable; but after all our Lord expressly declares, that the stony ground hearers actually *believed* for a *while*, and *fell away*. Such a declaration is not applicable to Calvin's elect, any more than to his reprobates; for this good reason—that both classes exist only in imagination.

VI. That a man may fall from grace and perish for ever is manifest from the xviiith of Ezekiel. The design of God in this chapter is to vindicate his own equity. This he does by declaring,—that the wicked man shall *die* or be *punished*, though his father had been a truly righteous man—that, the righteous man shall live and be rewarded, however wicked, his father might have been. God loves righteousness and will reward it; he hates wickedness and will punish it. These two propositions are illustrated, and proved throughout the chapter, In proof of the latter, he says; "But when the *righteous* man *turneth* away from *his righteousness*, and *committeth iniquity*, and *doeth according* to *all* the *abominations*, that the *wicked* man *doeth*—shall *he live*? *All his righteousness* that he *hath done* shall *not* be *mentioned:* in *his trespass* that he *hath trespassed*, and in *his sin* that he *hath sinned*, *in them shall he die.* ver. 24. And hence if he dies in his sin, where Christ is he cannot come. John viii. 24. Again, "when a *righteous* man *turneth away* from *his righteousness* and *committeth iniquity* and *dieth in them;* (this means temporal death.) for *his iniquity* that he *hath done*, shall he die." ver. 26. Here is eternal death, which follows death temporal. That this passage establishes the possibility of falling finally, will fully appear, from the following remarks.

1. The import of the term, *righteous;* and the *character*, indicated by it. Here, we observe; 1. That, the same word, *zadech*, in the Hebrew is translated *just* in ver. 5. and *righteous* in these verses. 2. That, it stands opposed to the term *wicked*, throughout the chapter. 3. That, the word *righteous*, in the scriptures, is invariably put in contrast, with the terms *wicked* and *unrighteous*. 4. That, if the *righteous man*, here spoken of, does not mean a *truly righteous man;* the *wicked man*, mentioned, on the same principle, cannot mean a *truly wicked man*. 5. That, the *righteous man*, here described, is one, that must have turned from wickedness, ver. 21,—that sinneth

not, ver. 4.—that doeth that which is lawful and right. ver. 5.—and that walks in the statutes, keeps the judgments of the Lord and deals truly. ver. 9. Then comes the testimony of Jehovah; he is *just*, he shall *surely live*, saith the Lord God." 6. By nature, "there is none righteous; not one;" and hence, the righteousness, here mentioned, must spring from faith. There is no righteousness without it. Let the following texts speak to this point, "But that *no man* is *justified* by the *deeds* of the *law* in the *sight of God*, it is *evident*, for the just shall live by faith." Gal. iii. 11. Therefore, we conclude, that a man is *justified* by *faith*, without the deeds of the law." Rom. iii. 28. "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his *faith* is *counted* for *righteousness*." Rom. iv. 5. "Ye are *all* the *children* of *God* by *faith* in Christ Jesus." Gal. iii, 26. "Having *predestinated* us unto the *adoption* of *children* by Jesus Christ." Eph. i. 5. "If *children* then *heirs*, *heirs* of *God*, and *joint heirs* with Christ." Rom. viii. 17. "In whom also we have *obtained* an *inheritance*, being *predestinated* according to the *purpose* of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." Eph. i. 11. What, now, is the inference from these scriptures?—That, the righteous man, who turneth away from his righteousness, and dieth in his sin, forfeits the favour of God—loses his faith, ceases to be a child of God, makes void his predestination to adoption, and to the inheritance of the saints in light; and having, by iniquity, obliterated his title to glory, he sinks deeper into eternal death, than if, he had never known the way of righteousness.

2. The absurdity, of explaining this passage in connexion with Calvin's views, impels us to acknowledge the possibility, that a righteous man may turn away from his righteousness and perish for ever. Let us notice the gloss put on the text in question. "That being an apostate, that *turned away from his righteousness*, his *own self-righteousness*, he only *passed* for *one*, *thought* himself one, appeared as one, and having all the *external marks* of *one*, was *judged* by *others* to be a *righteous man*, while he was *not so* in *reality*." Granting, for the sake of argument, this explanation, let us see how it will read; observing, at the same time, that righteousness stands opposed in this chapter to sin, iniquity, wickedness, and of course, to insincerity, hypocrisy, and polluted self-righteousness. Then, the text will read thus; "When the self-righteous and hypocritical man turneth away from his own self-righteousness, and committeth iniquity; and doeth according to the abominations that the wicked man doeth,—shall he live? All his self-righteousness,

insincerity, and hypocrisy, that he hath done, shall not be mentioned (happy man)! in his trespass (from self-righteousness and hypocrisy), that he hath trespassed; and in his sin (of turning away from self-righteousness), that he hath sinned, in them shall he die." Miserable man! So he is damned after all. Should he not rather have lived? He turned away from his self-righteousness- could he do a better thing? Such explanations are a scorn to God's word, and to the good sense of mankind. They invert every term in the chapter; *righteousness* for *wickedness*, *justice* for *iniquity*, *right* for *wrong*, *forgiveness* for *guilt*, and *life* for *death*. The very absurdity of the thing, independently of any regard for truth, drives a candid mind into the conclusion—that God, by the term righteous, means a truly righteous man; and hence, that such, beyond contradiction, may so apostatise as to die in sin and perish for ever. Let it be noted; that as *turning away*, from wickedness, means all wickedness, both in its love and practice; so *turning away*, from righteousness, means a complete departure, both in spirit and conduct.

3. According to Calvinism, a righteous man cannot finally fall, or become subject to eternal death. The loss of one soul would break the decree,—spoil the fixed, definite, and certain number of the elect; and hence, the sweet doctrine of final perseverance is necessary to the creed. It may be sweet in the mouth, but it becomes very bitter, on being swallowed with Ezekiel's roll. Now, if God made such a decree he surely knew it, when, he inspired the prophet to write this chapter. On this principle what could he mean? Are we to understand the passage thus? "When the righteous man turneth away from his righteousness," which many do, but according to my decree none can; "and committeth iniquity," I will not impute it, on account of my decree; "and doeth according to all the abominations, that the wicked man doeth," who is not included in the decree, "shall he live? According to my revealed will by the spirit of inspiration, he shall not; but according to my secret decree he shall. "All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned;" but still he is righteous by imputation; "in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin, that he hath sinned, in them shall he die," viz., by imputation only; for being an elect, he can never perish. Does not this embrace the very spirit of the system; and afford as good a defence, as the nature of the thing admits? True! it makes God's ways unequal; it attributes two wills to God—a secret and revealed one; it destroys the distinction between the abominations of an elect, and those of a reprobate; but, then, it preserves the decree in preference to reason,

revelation, the unity of God's nature, as having but one will, and the character of his perfections. Now, it may be as consistent to let Calvin's decree shift for itself; and being attached to, and guided by reason, revelation, and the character of God, conclude that in Ezek. xviii. he used words in their common acceptation, and really meant, that, it is *possible* for a righteous man, *so* to *fall*, as to *perish everlastingly*.

VII. In connexion with this passage, we now notice, Heb. vi. 4. 6. "For it is impossible for those who were *once enlightened*, and *have tasted* of the *heavenly gift*, and were made *partakers* of the *Holy Ghost*, And *have tasted* the *good word* of *God*, and the *powers* of the *world* to *come*, If they shall *fall away*, to *renew* them *again* unto *repentance;* seeing they *crucify* to *themselves* the *Son* of *God afresh* and *put him* to *an open shame*." Let us candidly examine the import of these declarations. Every expression is fraught with strength; and requires to be distinctly understood.

1. What is implied in *being enlightened*? To the law and to the testimony is the best mode of answering. Examine the following scriptures. Jesus Christ is the true and only source of light—of knowledge and intellectual illumination; and is called the sun of righteousness. Hence, we read; "The Lord is *my light* and my salvation." Ps. xxvii. 1. "God is the Lord which hath shewed us light." Ps. cxviii. 27. Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a *light* unto my path, cxix. 105. The *entrance* of thy word *giveth light*." ver. 130. "The commandment of the Lord is pure *enlightening* the *eyes*. Ps. cxix. 8. Lighten mine eyes lest I sleep the sleep of death." Ps. xiii. 8. "To whom now I send thee, to *open* their *eyes*, and to *turn* them from *darkness* to *light* and from the *power* of Satan unto God; that they *may receive forgiveness* of *sins*, and *inheritance* among them which are *sanctified* by *faith* that is *in me*." Acts. xxvi. 18. "The *eyes* of *your understanding being enlightened*; that ye *may know* what is the hope of his calling, and what the *riches* of the *glory* of his *inheritance* in the *saints*." Eph. i. 18. "But call to remembrance the former days. in which after ye *were illuminated*, ye endured a great fight of afflictions." Heb. x. 32. "For God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath *shined* in *our hearts*, to *give* the *light* of the *knowledge* of the *glory of God*, in the face of Jesus Christ." 2. Cor. iv. 6. "While we *look not* at the *things* which *are seen*." ver. 17. These scriptures are sufficient to determine the meaning, of being *once enlightened*. They shew the author to be Christ, the instrument to be the word of eternal truth; and the agent the ever blessed spirit of God. The eyes must be opened

in order to be enlightened; the spirit of God alone can effect this; and it is equally impossible, for such a great work to be done, without faith; and this faith must be preceded by repentance. It is evident, therefore, that, those who were *once enlightened*, were *truly convinced* of *sin*, by the entrance of the Word, and the operations of the spirit of God; and not only so, but believed in him, who is light itself to the salvation of the soul, Their eyes were opened and enlightened to this end—that, they might receive forgiveness of sin, and sanctification,—that they might know the hope of their calling, and the richness of their inheritance—that they might see the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ—and that, they might look at the things which are unseen and eternal; or, like Moses, "endure by seeing him who is invisible." "Repentance from dead works," therefore, and faith toward God," are necessarily implied in being *once enlightened.*

2. As they were enlightened to a certain end: so that end was obtained by them; and hence, the Apostle adds, "and *have tasted* of the *heavenly gift*" Let us ascertain what is meant here by the heavenly gift. "By grace ye are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." Eph. ii. 8. If this be the gift; then they were justified by it, and had peace with God, and the fruits of the spirit. "If thou knewest the gift of God," saith Jesus, to the woman of Samaria; "Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift," saith the Apostle Paul. Jesus himself is the gift of the Father, John iii. 16.; and if he be the heavenly gift, then he "*dwelt* in *their hearts* by *faith*," Eph. iii. 17; they tasted of his goodness, were "*partakers* of the *divine nature*," 2 Pet. i. 4; or, as the Apostle says, Heb. iii. 14. "For we are *made partakers* of *Christ*, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end." "Repent and be baptised every one of you—for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts. ii. 38. If this be the heavenly gift; it is evident, that those, who were once enlightened, received it to bear witness with their hearts, that they were the children of God. Again, "The wages of sin is death; but the *gift* of *God* is *eternal life*, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. vi. 23 If this be the gift of God; the persons of whom the Apostle speaks, had everlasting life, the foundation of it was laid in the soul; they enjoyed the root, knowledge, or foretaste of it, as explained, chap. i. and No. ii. Again, "But not as the offence, so also is the *free gift*. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the *grace* of *God*, and the *gift* by *grace*, which is by one man Jesus Christ, hath *abounded* unto *many*. And not as

it was by one that sinned, so is the *gift:* for the judgment was by one to *condemnation*, but the *free gift* is of *many offences* unto *justification*. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they, which *receive abundance* of *grace*, and of the *gift* of *righteousness*, shall *reign* in *life* by one Jesus Christ." Rom. v. 15-17. Here, now, is what, I directly understand by the *heavenly gift*. It is the *gift* by *grace*—the peculiar favour of God shewn to every man the instant he believes. It is the *free gift*, which is *opposed* to *condemnation* and *consists* in the *remission* of *many offences;* it is the giving up the hand-writing—the long list of crimes into the hand of the offender, that, he may destroy it, the moment he believes in Jesus. It is called the *gift* of *righteousness;* because, it flows from the merits of Christ; or, because the remission of sin is our evangelical righteousness, which we receive by faith; and this is accompanied by abundance of grace, the love of God, and the influence of the spirit; whereby, such have access into the holiest of all, and rejoice in the prospect of the glory of God. The heavenly gift, then consists in the remission of sins, and the various benefits, which accompany and flow from it; such as adoption, regeneration, and a title to the inheritance of children; and hence, the foundation, indicated by the "*doctrine* of baptism," was laid in the hearts of those spoken of by the Apostle; seeing the doctrine, signified by the outward washings, is the being born again, which necessarily includes the previous forgiveness of sin, by faith.

3. The Apostle, then, asserts, that such "were made *partakers* of the *Holy Ghost*." This naturally follows the heavenly gift—the remission of sins, and the regeneration of the soul. "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the *spirit* of his son into *your hearts*, crying Abba, Father." Gal. iv. 6. "The *spirit itself* beareth *witness* with *our spirits*, that we *are the children* of *God*." Rom. viii. 16. To be a *partaker* of the Holy Ghost is to enjoy his testimony, his fellowship and influence, arising from his actual indwelling in the soul. The meaning and applications of the word *partaker* establishes this. "And he, that thresheth in hope, should be *partaker* of his hope." 1 Cor. ix. 10. Does not this mean an actual enjoyment of the fruit of his labour? "For we are all *partakers* of that one bread." 1 Cor. x. 17. Surely this means to eat, so that the bread becomes incorporated with our substance. "Ye cannot be *partakers* of the Lord's table, and of the table of devil's." ver. 21. This relates to an actual reception. "Forasmuch, as the children are *partakers* of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same." Heb. ii. 14. Does not this mean a real participation

of our nature, and not a mere shew or resemblance? "Wherefore, holy brethren, *partakers* of the heavenly calling." iii. 1. "For we are made *partakers* of Christ." ver. 14. "For if ye be without chastisement whereof all are *partakers*, then are ye bastards and not sons." xii. 8. All these express a genuine, and actual participation; and hence, to be *made partakers* of the *Holy Ghost*," is one of the very strongest expressions, found in the old or new Testament, to indicate the *indwelling*, *fellowship*, *fruits*, and *consolations* of the *spirit*. This clause relates to the "laying on of hands," ver. 2; for, by the laying on of the Apostle's hands, the Holy Ghost was often given.

4. To "*taste* the *good word* of *God* and the *powers* of the *world* to come," follow, in natural order, after repentance, faith, remission of sin, regeneration, and the indwelling of the spirit. For, it is only by the spirit, that any man can relish fully the great truths of the Gospel, receive nourishment from the sincere milk of the word, or feed on it, as upon strong meat. It is, by the teaching of the Holy Ghost, that spiritual things can be compared with spiritual. To taste the *good word* of God is to receive, and to be nourished with the very marrow and fatness of Gospel promises. To be a partaker of, or to taste of the "powers of the world to come," or of the future state, is to *enjoy* the *hope* of a *glorious resurrection*, the *joy* that arises from the conviction, that the *judge* is *our friend;* and to *know*, that "if the *earthly house* of *this tabernacle* were *dissolved*, we *have* a *building* of *God*, a *house not made with hands*, *eternal* in the *heavens*." By the world to come, is not meant, the age of the Gospel dispensation for this reason, it had come already; it was not future but present, when the Apostle wrote; and hence, the world to come is the eternal world. The tasting of its powers, is in agreement with ver. 2. "the *resurrection* of the *dead* and *eternal judgment*." Such then, had tasted by faith and hope, opening the spiritual senses of the soul, the powers of the resurrection, eternal judgment, and the everlasting life founded on these. This passage,in fact, indicates the highest state of christian experience; and *no more forcible language could be found* to *express it*, in the *whole compass* of *Inspiration*.

5, "The preceding participles, *photisthentis*, *geusamenous*, and *genethentas*, being aorists," saith Macknight, "are rightly rendered by our translators in the past time; *who were enlightened*, *have tasted*, *were made partakers:* wherefore, *parapesontas* being *also* an *aorist*, ought to have been translated in the past time, *have fallen away*. Nevertheless our translators, (folfowing Beza, who, without *any* authority from ancient manuscripts,

has inserted in his version the word *si*, if), have rendered this clause, *if they shall fall away;* that this text might not appear to contradict the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints. But as no translator should take upon him to add to, or alter the Scriptures, for the sake of any favourite doctrine, I have translated the word in the past time, *have fallen away*, according to its true import, as standing in connexion with the other aorists in the preceding verses." Here, then, the Apostle is not speaking of what may be, but of what has been already; for some individuals, of the high and holy experience now pointed out, had at the time Paul wrote, actually *fallen away;* so that, it was impossible to renew them again unto repentance. A person may fall by sin, and again rise on the platform of divine mercy; but these had fallen *away*—had dropped over it, without possibility of rising again. They fell away from the very profession of christianity, and rejecting the very highest evidence, external and internal, that God can give to man, while, he is a probationer, and moral agent in this world; they crucified to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame; thereby, approving of those, who did crucify him, rendering him and his religion contemptible; and shewing, if in their power, that thay would crucify him again. They had even forgotten, that they were purged from their old sins. 2 Pet. i. 9.

6. The gloss, which Calvinism puts on this passage, is just the same, that is used for the xviiith of Ezek. These are hypocrites and *apostates* from *hypocrisy* and *hollow professions*. They *were enlightened* with "*rational knowledge*," and "*common illumination*." They *were partakers* of the *Holy Ghost*, with "*miraculous gifts;*" but they had "no true *saving grace;*" so that hypocrites in those days were very highly favoured by the spirit of truth; for by giving them those gifts, they were thus enabled to practise deceit under the broad seal of heaven! They merely *tasted* the *heavenly gift*, the *good word* of *God*, and the *powers* of the *world* to *come*, "like persons in the market, who *taste* and buy nothing;" and hence, their misery is great, and their end is to "be burned," for apostatising from hypocrisy and mere profession,—for shutting their eyes against common illumination, that gave them only rational knowledge; and they are to be damned to all eternity for *falling away* from a little mole hill of their own erection, as a warning to the saints not to apostatise! This doctrine mangles the divine word, sets all rational criticism at defiance, and opens a door for error in every shape and form. If the terms in the passage are to be thus filed away by the secret decree of Calvin; others, however, important, may share the same fate. "His *fruit*

was *sweet* to *my taste*," saith the spouse; but according to Calvinism, this means only a mere taste without any enjoyment. "While Belshazzar *tasted* the *wine*," saith Daniel, means according to this mode of criticism, that he merely tried but did not drink! "That Jesus Christ by the grace of God should *taste* death for *every man*," saith Paul, only means a mere taste without much pain or actual suffering. A false creed produces a false standard of criticism, whereby, the whole system of revealed truth may be explained away. The Apostle in this passage compares spiritual things with natural. A child naturally born first *sees* the light, then receives and *tastes* proper nourishment, and *partakes* of the things of this world; and he, who is born of the spirit *sees*, *tastes*, and *partakes* of *spiritual things* in a *similar manner*. From this light, sweetness, and enjoyment, the Apostle shews, that some had already apostatised, who could not be restored; not from any defect in the power of God; but from their falling away beyond the reach of any moral influence, capable of saving their souls. "The gifts and callings of God are without repentance"; and hence, however, these acted, he could not repent of having bestowed blessings on them, though they turned them in the end to their own destruction.

VIII. Another scripture equally strong and decisive, is recorded in Heb. x. 26-29. It is assigned as a reason for perseverance to which the Apostle exhorted in the preceding verses. "For if we *sin wilfully* after that we have *received* the *knowledge* of the *truth*, there *remaineth no more sacrifice* for *sins*. But a *certain fearful looking* for of *judgment* and *fiery indignation*, which shall *devour* the *adversaries*. He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: Of *how much sorer punishment*, suppose ye, shall *he* be *thought worthy*, who *hath trodden under foot*, the *Son* of *God*, and *hath counted* the *blood* of the *covenant*, wherewith he *was sanctified* an *unholy thing*, and *hath done despite* to the *spirit* of *grace*." What, now, is the first and natural impression made on the mind by reading this passage?—That a believer *may fall finally* and that *some actually did*. All parties are agreed, that, it relates to *final apostacy* from the faith and profession of christianity. Hence, it is not applicable to backsliders in the common acceptation of the term; nor, should it ever form a stumbling block in the way of those, who having fallen from grace, are heartily desirous of returning. It certainly proves the *possibility* of falling from the highest state of grace, and exhibits, as a fact, the fall of one, who "counted the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and did despite to the spirit of grace." It is mere trifling with

the word of truth to deny, that the possibility here asserted, and the fact stated has no relation to believers. The whole epistle and the context prove the contrary. The Apostle is speaking of believers and of none else; of those who "were *sanctified;* ver. 10, who "entered into the holiest by the blood of Jesus;" ver. 19., who "drew near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having it *sprinkled from an evil conscience;* v. 22, who were expected to "hold fast the profession of their faith—and not to forsake the assembling of themselves together, so much the more, as they saw the day of death and judgment approaching;" ver. 25. "For," saith he, "if we sin wilfully"—we, who have thus believed, enjoyed and professed —"if *we* sin wilfully," deliberately, and perseveringly, so as to become hardened through the deceitfulness of sin, "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins."—the atonement of Christ being obstinately rejected, there is no other mode of satisfying divine justice; and hence, the fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation, which succeeds the loss of faith, hope, and the consolations of the gospel, in the mind of the fallen believer. The Apostle demonstrates the justice of this punishment, by appealing to the destruction of offenders under the law of Moses; and then appeals to the good sense and judgment of his readers in relation to the christian apostate, who despises greater blessings under the new covenant. Does not his language relate to one fact out of many? "Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall *he* be *thought worthy* who hath *trodden* under *foot* the *Son* of *God*"—the christian lawgiver and Saviour of the world—"and hath counted the blood of the covenant an unholy thing,"—as the blood of a seducer or impostor, who was justly crucified for his own crimes; that very blood, "wherewith, he," the apostate, "was sanctified"—admitted into the blessings, and privileges of the new covenant, dedicated to God, and inwardly renewed in the spirit of his mind; "and hath done despite to the spirit of grace"—even that spirit, who witnessed with his heart, that he was a child of God, and inspired him with that grace, which was sufficient to preserve him unto everlasting life. Here, in fact, is the sin against the Holy Ghost: and this committed, not by a Scribe or Pharisee; but by one, who had received the knowledge of the truth, who was introduced into covenant with God, was sanctified by the blood of his Son, and enjoyed the grace and influence of his spirit.

Now, if the Apostle, when, he wrote this tremendous warning, knew that there was an elect number, fixed, definite and certain, not one of whom could be lost; where, was his sincerity in writing in this manner? Why did he propose an impossible case? If he knew it

not; then, he might consistently write thus, being ignorant of the modern doctrines of grace and Calvinian perseverance. If the Hebrews, whom, he addressed, had been taught, that having grace once they must have it still; would they not have wondered at his inconsistency, and have been mightily puzzled to find out to whom the allusion was made? Would they have classed his impossible supposition—his case absolute, introduced with an "if," among the means of grace designed to prevent them from apostacy? Would they not rather have looked on the epistle as a forgery, coming from an ignorant, false Apostle, who wished to teach them Arminianism, rather, than the sweet doctrine of finished salvation? How astonishing indeed! that Paul the inspired Apostle should write, *if* God's decree stand—*if* grace be irresistable—*if* an elect can never fall finally; when they all knew, there was no *if* in the matter, having been instructed previously, by the Apostle, that every thing, was fixed before the foundation of the world! The inference is evident—if Paul was a true Apostle, the Hebrews were not Calvinists in principle; and if they were, he was either a false Apostle, or the epistle to the Hebrews is a forgery.

IX. The sequel of chap. x. of this epistle brings us to the same conclusion, that a believer may finally fall. The Apostle in ver. 30. 31. assigns a reason for the punishment stated in ver. 29, as falling on the apostate. "*For we know him that hath said vengeance,*" or the actual execution of judgment without mercy, "*belongeth unto me, I will recompence,*" or deal out this vengeance, *saith the Lord. And again, the Lord shall judge his people,* viz, those of them, who forsake him; and that, with greater rigour than he will judge the heathen. "It is a *fearful thing* to *fall* into the *hands* of the *living God.*" Here, then, are the reasons assigned for punishing the apostate believer, who counts the blood of the covenant, wherewith, he was sanctified an unholy thing. God is the living and true God; he exists not only at all times, but possesses every attribute, that constitutes him the righteous governor of the world. Justice, truth, and holiness are essential to his nature; and characterise him in the administrations of his kingdom. He immutably loves righteousness and hates iniquity; and hence, he will punish the apostate in proportion to the privileges bestowed and the blessings despised. The Apostle comes to this conclusion, in ver. 35. "*Cast* not *away*, therefore, *your confidence* which hath *great recompence* of *reward.*" Here, it is implied, that they might cast it away; and, of course, lose the reward, which the Apostle exhibits as a motive to perseverance. The counterpart of this conclusion is found

in ver. 38. "Now the just shall live by faith: but if any man draw back my soul shall have no pleasure in him." The sum of the Apostle's argument is this; keep the confidence and it shall be rewarded of God; cast it away, or draw back from the field of battle, vilely throwing your shield of faith aside; and his soul shall have no pleasure in you; and hence, depart from you for ever. Let it be observed that in the last text, the words *any man*, are not in the original. It was the infirmity of our translators, on many occasions, to favour their own creed. They should have inserted *he*, instead of *any man;* and have left the text thus. "Now the *just* shall *live* by *his faith:* but if *he draw back* my *soul* shall have *no pleasure* in *him.*" From all this, it is evident; that Paul was not reasoning concerning Calvin's elect. How could one of them cast away his shield, when, it was fastened to his arm by a decree, as old and as strong, as that which binds the world together? How could any of them draw back unto perdition, when, this irresistable decree impelled them forward into glory? What folly to talk of possibilities, or impossibilities, in reference to men, that could not possibly fall away; and that, it was impossible any of them should perish!

But does not the Apostle say in ver. 39. "We are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them who believe unto the saving of the soul." True! he advances this, as their experience at the time, and he advances a great truth; but the whole epistle, and the particular parts, now noticed, go to shew, that they *might* draw back unto perdition; because others had done so before them. He does not say, "we are not of them who *cannot* draw back unto perdition; but of them who *must* believe to the saving of the soul." This is not his language; for as Paul knew nothing of Calvin's election, he was equally ignorant of his infallible perseverance. Hence, he speaks like one, who considers man a free and accountable agent; and not as a philosophical necessarian, who materialises the soul, by making it a proper subject of fate, in robbing it of free will. For if a believer possess *true* freedom, he *may* fall like Satan or Adam; and if he do not; those, who hold the doctrine, must confound mind and matter and render the former, as inert, as the latter. Where, then, is vice or virtue, blame or praise, punishment or reward? and is not conscience a kind of mock or false judge, implanted in the bosom of of men, to condemn them for actions they could not avoid; and approve of those, as their own, which were performed by another agency?

X. Let us now glance at Paul's experience on this point. Surely, if there ever was an elect, he was one. What, then, does he say of

himself? "But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should become a castaway." 1 Cor. ix. 27. In this passage and its connexion, he alludes to the Istmian games; and lest, he should be (adokimos), *disapproved*, rejected, or cast away by the judge at the last; and hence miss the prize, he kept his body under. Now the Apostle laboured, ran, and contended to this end. Did he thus strive to prevent an event, which, in its own nature, was absolutely impossible? If St. Paul believed, he was absolutely elected to eternal life, and of consequence, that he could never possibly fall away; why in this text, does he assert the possibility of the thing? Was it not possible for him to cease running, wrestling, or striving? Was it not possible for him to refrain from keeping his body under? If this was possible; was there no possibility of his becoming a reprobate in the end? Was the Apostle a free, or a necessary agent? If the latter; how could he say *I* run, *I* fight, *I* beat not the air, *I* keep under my body? If the grace of God wrought *irresistably* in him; could he have spoken truth in using this language? It certainly wrought so in him, that to it, he ascribed the glory; but, let us never forget, that while grace receives the glory, it is Paul that gives it; or else, he was no agent whatever; he was not "a worker with God." God wrought all without Paul's agency, if he was not a free agent; and hence, he need not have been solicitous to obtain the crown, seeing he never strove, ran, fought, or persevered for it; inasmuch, as he was not a free agent, viz. was no agent at all! If Paul was a free agent; then, he was just, as free to sit still, as to run; as free to retire from the field, as to fight; and as free to indulge the infirmities and lusts of the body, as to keep it under. He was as free to yield to temptation as to resist it, and to neglect the grace of God as to use it; and consequently, he was free either to fall or stand, by the use or the neglect of the means, which God put within his power. Rob the Apostle of this; and while, you number him among the elect, you blot his name from the list of intelligent, rational and free beings, and class him among the inferior animals of creation, who are necessarily governed, by the strongest motive.

XI. The spirit of inspiration is the same in all; and, therefore, St. Peter agrees with Paul on the subject now in hand. Who can read his second epistle, especially, and not be convinced, that, it is possible for a believer to fall finally away? Let us attend to one passage in chap. ii. 20-22. "For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus

Christ they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. For it had been bette not to have known the way of righteousness, than after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." Of whom now does the Apostle speak? of mere professors?—of hypocrites, or of believers? Of believers undoubtedly. 1 They had *escaped* the *pollutions* of the *world.* Th is only is the privilege of a believer. Examine the first chapter, where this language is expressly applied to those, who had obtained "precious faith," ver. 1. who were called through the knowledge of Christ to glory and virtue, ver. 3., who had received exceeding great and precious promises, whereby they were partakers of the divine nature, ver. 4; and then, he adds, "having escaped the corruption (or pollution) that is in the world through lust." 2. This escape could only be effected "through the *knowledge* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." The same is stated of those believers in the commencement of the epistle, who kept steadfast. Through the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, they obtained "like precious faith" with the Apostle—Grace and peace were multiplied unto them, "through the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord;" and through *this knowledge* they had received all things that pertain unto life and godliness. This was the experience once of those, who became again entangled; and who, being washed from their sin in the blood of Jesus, returned to it again like the sow to her wallowing in the mire. 3. The Apostle tells us expressly, how, they were led away. There were false teachers among them, who privily brought in "damnable heresies, denying the Lord that bought them—a plain proof, that a man may perish for whom Christ died. These had forsaken the right way themselves, ver. 15; which it is reasonable to conclude, they could not have done, had they never walked in it. They were wells without water, clouds carried with a tempest, to whom the mist of darkness is reserved for ever, ver. 17. They spoke great swelling words of vanity in their antinomian zeal, and allured through the lusts of the flesh, "those that *were clean escaped* from *them* who *live* in *error.*" By these, they were seduced, overcome, and brought again into bondage, until the end of them was worse than the beginning; they became more corrupt and wicked afrer their fall, than they were before their conversion. Of these the Apostle speaks without hope. "It had been *better* for them *not* to *have known* the *way* of *righteousness.*" Why

so? Were they not among the elect? They could never fall finally. The dog may return to his vomit; the sow to her wallowing in the mire, but they must be brought back again. But what does Peter say of their return? Nothing whatever. Hear his exhortation in conclusion. "Ye therefore beloved, seeing ye know these things before, *beware* lest *ye also*," like those now described, "*being led away* with the *error* of the *wicked*, fall from your own steadfastness, But," unlike to them who became *barren* and *unfruitful*, and hence, *forgot* even, that they *were purged* from *their old sins*, i. 9. "grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." And is it not possible for a believer to fall and perish for ever? Here then, the Apostle Peter agrees with Paul on this subject.—and not only speaks, of the possibility, of the thing; but also alludes to facts that were well known to those, whom, he addressed? St. Jude describes the same kind of characters; and tells us—that they were "twice dead," first in Adam, and secondly in themselves, having lost the knowledge of Christ, which is life eternal; "trees plucked up by the roots;" and hence withered, though they had been planted by the rivers of water; and he concludes by telling us, that to these "wandering stars," who had forsaken their proper orb, "is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever." Both he and Peter compare such apostates to the "angels, which *kept not* their *first estate;* but *left* their *own habitation;*" and hence, as the latter departed from their religion in heaven, the former have fallen and forsaken theirs upon earth.

XII. The various exhortations, &c. to perseverance, demonstrate the possibility of a believer falling finally away. Let us quote a few of them. "Watch ye—stand fast in the faith"—"Receive not the grace of God in vain"—"Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God"—"Walk in love as Christ also hath loved us"—"Let no man deceive you with vain words"—"Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling"—"Let no man beguile you of your reward"—"Quench not the Spirit"—"Abstain from all appearance of evil"—"Take heed brethren lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God"—"Let us labour, therefore, to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief"—"We ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip"—"Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord is nigh"—"Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil goeth about as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour: whom resist stedfast in the faith"—"Add to your faith virtue, and to virtue

knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity." "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things ye shall never fall." On this point we observe.

1. It is either necessary, that these exhortations should be given and obeyed, or it is not. We cannot imagine them unnecessary, as this would be a reflection on the wisdom of the Holy Spirit. If they be necessary to our happiness and perseverance, we must fail of the end in view, unless they be obeyed. Obedience, therefore, is necessary to final perseverance. But obedience, though necessary in point of obligation, must be yielded freely; else, it is not obedience; but the result of absolute constraint. The sun is not obedient in shining, the ocean in rolling, or the wind in blowing. These are necessary agents, because they have no power to obey or disobey, but as they are acted upon. Christian obedience, however, is far different from this. For, it is the free, unnecessitated, and cordial submission of enlightened free-will to the will of God, as revealed in his word. Being made free from the tyranny of sin, by free grace, free-will is drawn into obedience by the enlightening, comforting, gentle and moral influence of the spirit, through the instrumentality of faith; and hence, while all its strength and succour are derived from God; it presents its operations freely, and not by absolute constraint. The highest exercise of free-will, at any time, is to submit to be saved, by free grace. The one mutually relates to the other. If grace be free; there must be a principle of freedom in man to receive it, use it, and ascribe to it, the glory of salvation. If there be no such principle in man; then grace is no more grace; but assumes the stern character of mere energy, or physical force. Every exhortation, caution, and command, necessarily, involves the fact, that man is a free agent, capable of receiving, or rejecting the grace, whereby, he may obey. If a believer cannot receive grace in vain, quench the spirit, grieve him, and lose the favour of God, why were these exhortations given? Why were they not delivered in the form of prophesy, and not of exhortation, or command, as the Holy Spirit foresaw, that no believer could ultimately perish? Why did he not prophesy, that they could not, instead of giving cautions, exhortations, &c. in such a form as implies, that they might perish?

2. An answer is ready to these queries. "God has *decreed* the *means* with the *end*; and hence, exhortations, cautions and comcommands are given." Let us examine this view of the subject, and ascertain, whether, it be fallacious or not. If God decreed the means;

it is evident, they must be either of a *moral* or *physical character*. If the latter constitute the true nature of the means; then, absolute necessity secures the final salvation of the believer: aed hence, there can be no free-will, no moral obligation, no virtue or vice, no praise or blame, no reward or punishment. Exhortation, admonition, and precept are unnecessary and absurd; for in this case, the physical energy, which actuates the believer, being irresistible, the result must be necessary, infallible and absolute; and therefore, a river might as properly be exhorted to keep its course, the ocean not to forget its ebb and flow, or the sun be admonished to deviate from his amplitude or azimuth, at a certain time, as for believers to be warned of a danger, which does not exist; or be exhorted to do a duty, which they cannot but perform. If the means, therefore, be of a physical and not of a moral nature; it follows, that God could not have decreed exhortations, promises, threatnings or cautions, as part of the means; for then, he would have decreed an absurdity.

3. If it be asserted, however, "that they are part of the means, because the same Spirit, which inspired them, *effectually persuades* every elect person to obey them, without infringing on the freedom of any;" it may be necessary to examine this mode of accounting for the exhortations, cautions, and commands, given to those, who must be infallibly saved. If the elect be *effectually* and *finally persuaded* by the Holy Spirit, to obey these exhortations and be eternally saved; I would ask, Why this perseverance is not so effectual at all times, or at one time, more than another? There is an elect—one, who is fallen from God—one, who has spent years in the depth of wickedness; but in the end, *he* is to be effectually persuaded. Why is he not persuaded *now?* Surely the spirit regards him now, as much as, he will do at any future period Why does he not effectually persuade him now to return? The Holy Ghost cannot be in love with his wickedness. If not; then, why does he not persuade him to renounce it, at once? The fault must rest some where. It cannot rest with the Holy Spirit; this would be blasphemy to insinuate; it rests, therefore with the man himself; and hence, at present, he is grieving and quenching the spirit of God. Now, the operations of the spirit must be either, of a physical nature, involving necessity of obedience; or they must be of a moral character. I. they are physical; then, the man could not resist; he must obey; and his present wicked state could not possibly exist, except we conclude, that the spirit takes as much pleasure in the fallen man's wickedness, as he does in his obedience. To this blasphemous conclusion we cannot come. The operations of the Spirit, therefore,

must be of a moral nature. If they are moral now, they must be so in future; and hence, they may be resisted unto the end, and the man finally perish.

4. If the operations, which produce effectual persuasion in the mind of an elect, be of a moral character; it is evident, that such persuasions could never force the will; it still remains free; and its compliance with the motives must take place, in order to render the persuasion effectual. If so; the elect person may resist; and in this resistence lose his soul. If the elect cannot resist; then, the operations are not moral but physical and irresistible; the mind of such a one is not free; and hence, he is not accountable, and stands incapable of praise or blame, virtue or vice, and is not a fit subject, either of reward or punishment. In addition to this; it necessarily follows from the previous reasoning, that exhortations, cautions, commands, &c., cannot be ranked among the means of infallible perseverance, seeing they are of a *moral nature;* and the infallible means, or rather agency is of a *physical nature*, operating necessarily upon the mind. For if the infrustrable operations of the spirit be the final cause of the restoration and preservation of the now fallen person; the exhortations, &c. of the gospel cannot possibly be classed with the means either of restoration or preservation, seeing they are totally of a different character—the one being *moral* and the other *physical*. Hence, the boasted argument, of God having decreed the means with the end, falls to the ground; inasmuch, as it sets the Scripture in its commands, exhortations, and cautions, in direct opposition to the inward workings of the same Spirit which inspired it.

XIII. Let us, now, investigate the import of the promises and threatnings recorded in the word of Gord, respecting the final perseverance, of the saints. According to Calvinism, God hath absolutely promised final perseverance to the elect. The promises are but the outbeamings of his secret decree—the manifestation of his eternal purpose—that not one of the fixed, definite, and certain number can possibly be lost. If so; how shall we reconcile these absolute promises, and the threatnings of the gospel? Both proceed from the same God, and are distributed to the same individuals. It is the nature of promise to excite and encourage confidence and hope; and threatnings, on the other hand, operate upon fear, Take, for instance, the churches mentioned in the book of revelation. Unto the church of Ephesus Christ saith. "Remember, therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent." Now, as the primitive teachers and founders of

these churches, all taught "the doctrines of grace," it is but reasonable to conclude, that the people, of Ephesus, were fully instructed by Paul in the absolute nature of the promises, that they could never finally fall, for being of the number of the elect, it is impossible one of them could perish! Then, why does our Lord threaten them? Why does he say, he will remove their candlestick and, thereby, deprive them of the light and the means? According to their former instruction, How could they fear? and according to his threatning, Why should they not? Did our Lord mean, that he would break his eternal decree, and suffer the elect to perish? If the promise was absolute, was not the threatning a mockery? and if the threatning was real and calculated to raise in their minds a dread of eternal death, How could the promise be absolute? If it be said, "that they did not know the promise to be such," then it follows, that they were not instructed in the modern "doctrines of grace;" and of course, that absolute election is an invention of after times; and if, it be asserted, that they knew it; then, our Lord's threat could excite no fear or drive them to repent. "If any man draw back, saith God, "my soul shall have no pleasure in him." No believer can draw back to perdition, saith Calvin; therefore, God's threat is in vain. If we sin wilfully," saith the Apostle, "after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins; but a certain fearful looking for of judgment, and of fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." "It is impossible for an elect to sin *wilfully*, his will never fully consents"—that contradicts the Apostle's *if*. "If an elect sin wilfully, he must be restored;" then, he has nothing certainly to fear, and this contradicts the Apostle again, who asserts, that "the fiery indignation," which is the object of dread, "shall devour the adversaries." Now, how God could threaten to do that, which his own decree had rendered absolutely impossible to be done, is unreasonable to believe; and hence, as the decree and threatning are at variance, it is our duty to abide by revelation, and reject the inventions of men. A threatning, that cannot be fulfilled, can and ought to excite no dread. A divine threatning should excite it, because the execution must be possible, or it never would have been uttered. This possibility is the only thing for which we contend, because it proves that a believer may fall finally away.

If it be asserted, again, "that the threatning is used as a means to prevent apostacy, and excite to perseverance," we refer to section XII., where this is already answered, in speaking of the exhortions, &c. In addition to what was then said, it may be observed, that

this view of the matter, exhibits the character of the Divine being in an extrordinary light. Here, is a fixed, certain, and definite number of men, chosen from all eternity to everlasting life. It is impossible for one of them to perish; and yet, each and every one, of them, is first threatened with damnation, if he does not believe in Christ; at the same time, He, who utters the the threat, decreed from all eternity, that he should believe: and thus, he is furnished with a motive to faith, that has no truth or reality in itself. Again, he is threatened, as a means of his perseverance, that God's soul shall have no pleasure in him, if he draw back, and that fiery indignation shall devour him; and yet, it was firmly decreed—that God should never leave him; and of course, that he never could be the subject of fiery indignation. Whether, now are these motives and means to be ranked with truth or falsehood? With truth, if it was possible for the man to fall finally away; and with falsehood, if there was no possibility. View, these threatnings in another connexion. Faith is the gift of God; and the operations of the Spirit are irrisistible, or at least incapable of frustration. Here, then, is an elect, who is threatened with eternal damnation, if he does not accept the gift, which God decreed from all eternity he *must* accept; and if he does not finally comply with operations and motives, which, he cannot possibly resist, or at all events frustrate! Thus, according to Calvinism, the promise of final salvation to the elect, is the manifestation of the secret and eternal decree; and the Divine threatnings to them, urging to acceptance of the gospel and perseverance in its means, are ranked by that system among the means. The threatning, however, is vain, useless, absurd and false; because it never can possibly be fulfilled; and hence, if that doctrine be true; the God, who made the promise, cannot be the same, who uttered the threatning; and the will of the one must be totally repugnant to that of the other. The only way, of avoiding this absurd conclusion, is by acknowledging a secret and revealed will in the same Being; while, it must be confessed, that His unity is thereby destroyed; and of course, that all the scriptures are false, which assert this doctrine. Hence, infidelity or absurdity is the necessary result from Calvin's "horrible decree."

We have now investigated every scripture of note, which bears on the subject of perseverance. The various ligaments have been cut, whereby, Calvin and his followers have united the system together; and it remains with the judicious reader to say, whether it be a rational, scriptural, and divine body of truth exclusively; or a mere skeleton, composed of true and artificial materials, dressed in scripture phraseology and dignified with the title of "doctrines of grace." From the

confident manner in which, some, especially of our raw divines, who are fired with antinomian zeal, hold it forth ; those, who are unskilled in theological subjects, might mistake it for a body of evangelical truth ; whereas, on examination, it is found only to exhibit the features and the form, but does not contain the unmixed substance of "the truth which is according to godliness." To the law and to the testimony, we have now appealed ; by that standard, it has now been tried ; in the balances of the sanctuary, it is now found wanting ; and being defective in one point, it can stand the test in none. If one of the elect may fall, and if some of them have, fallen finally ; the certain, definite and fixed number is broken, election is not absolute, grace is free for all and in all, it may be resisted and despised, man is a free agent and an accountable being, and Jesus Christ gave himself a ransom for all, so that it is the *fault* and not the *misfortune* of any who are lost.

CHAP. III.

THE TENDENCY AND RESULTS OF CALVIN'S DOCTRINE OF PERSEVERANCE.

Although, it is *possible* for a *believer* to *fall finally;* there is neither a *necessity*, nor a *danger* of such an event. By confounding possibility and danger, many reject the truth and run into the belief of infallible perseverance. Danger, in the common acceptation of the term, implies a probability of evil, befalling those, who are liable to it. Such cannot be happy, while, the cause of danger is at hand; but the mere possibility of evil coming upon us, when, all the means, necessary to avert it, are put within our own power, cannot destroy the security, which is essential to our happiness. It is possible, this instant, for the house to fall and kill me; but, I have no fear; because, there is no danger. It is possible for you to be killed, while travelling, either, by land or water; but being of sound mind and nerve, you apprehend no danger, and proceed, with as much confidence and happiness, as if no such possibility had a being. It is possible for many a one, to forfeit a good and profitable office; but to do so there may be neither necessity nor danger. There is nothing internal to produce necessity; nothing external to cause danger; inasmuch, as the individuals are acquainted with the duties to be done, and are of a steady resolution, and of long habit in performing them correctly. Such persons go on, as comfortably, as if there was no possibility of a forfeiture. Their circumstances form motives to watchfulness and diligence. Why, then, should a believer in Christ feel cast down by confounding possibility and danger? There is no necessity for such confusion of thought. There is the promise of God to keep us from falling; he is able to fulfil it; there is also the influence of the spirit and the consolations of his grace; there are the established means—hearing, reading, prayer, both private and publick, christian fellowship, and the ordinances of the gospel. True! we must watch, resist temptation, take up the cross and perform the private, social and publick duties of life; and thus hold fast the beginning of the confidence, and the hope firm unto the end. Now, what necessity for an absolute decree to effect all this? Was God distrustful, of his own care and faithfulness, and of the goodness and

connection of his own spirit? Did he foresee, that he would be so much engrossed with the government of other worlds, that, he could not attend to this at all times; and hence, placed the eternal happiness of his people, under the influence of a decree, which implies necessity of one kind or other, lest finally they should miss salvation? Is the Holy Spirit a mere creature—a necessary agent, that his gracious influences must be secured by a decree? Was God destitute of sufficient wisdom, in connecting such a virtue with his word and ordinances, as issues in this, he must secure the ultimate salvation of those, who believe, by a decree, which necessarily was anterior in point of order, to the appointment of the means. When, as individual arises to this decree, as a *ne plus ultra*, does he not withdraw his confidence and admiration in the *act*, from the wisdom, goodness, power, omnipresence, omniscience, and tender care of God at the *present*, and screen himself behind this bulwark of necessity, and thus delight in the darkness rather than the light? Here, in fact, is a recoiling from revelation and the government of God in the world, into a secret, concealed, dark, and mysterious decree. Is there nothing, at least mentally wrong in this? To this Calvinism owes its opponents. This is the rallying point in every case of decree. Let an opponent be driven from one scripture to another, until the hill of evidence be cleared; here, is a bulwark for confidence triumph, that can never fail. The decree stands fast—in the imagination; and of course, while, the disputant retains his power of thinking, it is impossible to drive him from his beloved retreat. The doctrine of infallible perseverance arises from this source—it is a muddy stream, which springs from the interior of this temple; and we now come to point out its tendency and results in various respects.

I. It *inspires a false confidence*. What, we are pitied for believing it possible, for a believer to fall finally from the grace of God, when, in, can be the error? If we believe in Christ, are regenerated, and have the witness of the spirit bearing testimony with our spirits, that we are the children of God; is not this sufficient? Will not believing in this manner save us? What necessity for believing, that we can never fall, when we are so secure, having now the grace of God, as those who believe this dogma? The believing any thing does not make the thing true. Faith finds the truth, but does not make it. If the doctrine be true, that a man cannot finally fall; a believer, who does not receive this point, cannot make it untrue by rejecting it. My believing that God exists, does not make him to exist. My believing that Christ died for me, does not cause the matter to be true. If

died for me and for all, whether, men believe it or not. It has been demonstrated, that Calvin's doctrine of perseverance is false, unscriptural and absurd. Your believing it does not make it true. You cannot prove it from one single scripture. Your faith is the result of fancy; it is founded on an imaginary decree; and hence, your confidence is false. We have the advantage of you in spite of all your reasonings. If it be true; we are as secure as you; and if it be false; we are on the safe side; while, your confidence is stretched beyond the bounds of truth into the region of falsehood. We have the advantage of you in another point of view. Should a believer, who thinks, he may fall finally, backslide from his redeemer, his creed becomes a powerful motive to excite him to return. He hears the threatnings of God with a true dread of fulfilment. He is aroused by exhortations and warnings, and should satan tempt him to imagine, that his case is safe, while, he continues in sin, he resists the devil; and either, returns to God, or refuses all consolation from a religious source, taking the entire blame to himself. On the contrary; let one, who holds the doctrine of infallible perseverance, lose the evidence of his acceptance and fall into sin; the devil avails himself of his faith, preaches that he cannot finally fall—that he must be brought back; and now, that, he has sinned, he may indulge himself, until, the Lord restore him in his own good time. Such is the confidence of a Cavinistic backslider, while, his friends, who are witnesses of his fall, begin to suspect his former sincerity and perhaps rank him among hypocrites and reprobates. Thus, he is liable according to this creed to be left to his false confidence and to perish through its delusive influence.

II. As the doctrine of Calvinistic perseverance produces a wrong confidence; it must in its own nature, lead the heart to a wrong source of consolation. Nothing is more common, than to hear, those, who embrace it, declare, that were they to let this doctrine go, they would lose their peace at once; and they wonder, how it is possible, for any one to be comfortable, who does not hold it. This matter requires a particular examination. If we can only learn from scripture, what is the source and instrumentality of a believer's consolation; we will discover forthwith, whether this opinion be essential or not to its enjoyment. Of one thing we are perfectly satisfied; that, while, a man lives in sin, he has no divine consolation. Isaiah lvii. 21. The *wrath* of *God abides* on him until, he forsakes his sin, and believes in Jesus Christ. John iii. 36. The instant, however, in which, he believes with the whole heart, his transgressions are forgiven, he is adopted into the family of God, and he receives the

witness of his spirit. Hence, "if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Rom. viii. 9, and he, who is made the child of God by faith, has "The spirit itself bearing witness with his spirit, that he is a child of God." Rom. viii. 16. What now is the testimony of the spirit? It is not, that the man must infallibly be saved; for this would imply, either, that he could never sin, or that let him sin as he may, he will be saved in the end. The spirit of God bears no such testimony as this. Like every other testimony or witness, it relates to a fact; and the fact is this—that as the man has now believed, he is now adopted into the family of God, he is now one of his children. Here is the grand source of his consolation. Faith brings the spirit into the heart; and the spirit opens, therein, the well-springs of everlasting life. The spirit's witness and consolations must necessarily be the same in kind, though different in degree, in various individuals. He cannot bear testimony to the heart of a Calvinist, that, he can never fall; and to that of an Armenian, that, he may; for the testimony of the spirit relates not to opinion on either side; but to the simple fact of being a child of God. Hence, it follows from this; that the high consolations professed by some Calvinists, from the consideration, that they can never fall away, must take their rise from some other source, than, the witness and indwelling of the spirit of God; for so far as faith and the testimony of the spirit, is concerned, the Armenian stands on the same common ground with him, and rejoices in the consolation, which these afford. Here, now, is the state of the case; the spirit is the very soul of christianity; it applies the atonement; it is the earnest of heaven; without it, there is neither peace, joy, or holiness: and no opinion, independently of its influence, can make the soul happy; and hence, it follows; that as it assures no man that he can never fall away, but dwells in the hearts of thousands, who believe they may; and yet they are happy, and rejoice in the prospect of the glory of God: they have no cause to regret the absence of a happiness, which they believe springs from a wrong source, and is the result of mere opinion, founded on wrong views, of the character and promises of God. The happiness, therefore, which flows from mere opinion is not of much value, being unsupported by experience. In this case, it is imaginary, and not experimental; and produces no real, moral influence, either, in the heart or conduct.

The consolation, that flows from mere opinion, cannot be of much importance in the estimation of an experienced christian; when, the opinion, itself, is of an undecided character, as it regards truth; and especially, if it be directly repugnant to the plain letter of revelation.

Many have delighted in opinions, which the general voice, of reason, and revelation, has condemned in many ages of the church. Socinus and his followers delighted in denying the Divinity and pre-existence of Christ; but did their happiness spring from a right source? Dr. Taylor was no doubt, highly consoled, in denying the doctrine of original sin, and substituting Christ's perfect goodness for atonement, instead of the merit of his blood; but was his consolation true or false? Winchester rejoiced exceedingly in the doctrine of universal restoration, in which, even devils are included; but he rejoiced in his own ravings, and not in the clear and distinct testimony of the Scripture. The Irvingites of the present day indulge in joy, at the discovery made by their vain and fanatic master—that Christ's human nature was sinful; they rejoice in their mimic Apostles and evangelists, in their mystic and ridiculous interpretation of scripture, in condemning every church to perdition but their own, and in the gift of tongues: and yet, by the acknowledgment of Baxter, who after practising among them, was delivered from their trammels, the devil was the chief spirit of inspiration. Could their joy be of a holy character? Another kindred party, though not so far advanced in peculiarities, the followers of a Mr. Darby, rejoice, "that Sunday is no sabbath"—that they are the nucleous of the universal church; and while, they profess the utmost christian love and kindness, are the most censorious party in relation to all who differ from them, now found in Ireland. They rejoice in gathering home the saints of the Lord from every party; and when fair means fail with the poor, they find others to bribe them; while, in general their hands are closed in relation to the Bible and Missionary societies. Whether, is their joy divine or human? There was a time when Mr Walker, a very narrow, proud sectarian, rejoiced in preaching without prayer, and often in his harrangues with the utmost pleasure, raked up the ashes of the venerable Wesley in the nether regions; while, he and his followers refused to unite even in family worship, with one who did not embrace their peculiarities; but, was their joy, that of a christian, or a heretick? Did it spring from God or from their own perverted judgments and foolish imaginations? The party and their joy have perished from society, as all their successors in narrow views ultimately will. What is the joy of our present race of millenarians —of the prophets, who have started up, and from the pulpit and the press, not only announce the personal reign of Christ on earth, but fix the date of his appearing? Is it not a very narrow, sectarian, and unchristian spirit, which condemns the well read, the judicious, the experienced, and the thinking portion of the christian

world, because they do not accede to the ravings of those, who are guided by their wishes and vain imaginanions? What is the joy of the inexperienced and raw-headed divine, who puffed up with the vanity of office, teaches in the social party, the private lecture, and sometimes even from the pulpit, that a belief in *his views* of the millenium is essential to salvation? Has not a deceived heart turned him aside? Is it not a fact, that discrepant, illusory, and ridiculous views of the millenium, engross the attention and converse of hundreds; so that, they are thereby drawn away from a contemplation of themselves, and of the inward and spiritual kingdom of Christ? Hence, the personal reign and resurrection of martyrs has become, even, among a great many of the clergy, as well as the laity, a kind of *Camera obscura*, or Kaleidescope, into which, every one gazes; and each turning up a new view, as the fancy warms into action, contributes to the religious joy and spiritual conviviality of the party. The christian, however, pious, who has the temerity to dissent from their opinions—to intimate, that the instrument of their pleasure is artificial, is sure to be mentally blind, unenlightened, and so far disordered in the optic nerves of his understanding; that, he, either, becomes an object of pity, or is struck off, at once, from the list of the elect!

Such is the confidence and consolation of opinion in past and present times! If you would lose all the comfort of religion by resigning the mere dogma, that a man cannot finally fall from grace; or if the very thought of this would lessen your present happiness, you have great reason to suspect, that your imagination, rather, than the indwelling of the spirit, is the chief source of your comfort. This doctrine is false; and its adherents are subject to temptations and delusions, which the doctrine contended for in these pages does not admit. The belief, that, if I lose my present witness and consolations of the spirit, they must be finally restored, opens a wide door for satan to tempt me to rest in the mere comfort of opinion, while, destitute of that supplied by the Holy Spirit; whereas, if I believe the spirit may depart; and when lost, may never return, I am furnished by every rational and moral motive to watchfulness and prayer, and excited never to be at rest, without a true and scriptural evidence of my acceptance. Here, then, it is evident; the doctrine of Wesley has an elevated ascendancy above that of Calvin.

III. We, now, come to observe one of the most striking features of distinction, between infallible perseverance, as a doctrine, and that of the possibility of falling finally from grace. While, the latter engages every motive divine and human—motives from the

past, the present, and the future, in behalf of watchfulness, prayer, and perseverance in the use of every means, which leads to holiness of heart and life; the former, naturally, and legitimately, from the premises it lays down, tends to sin. This is a charge, from which, the united ingenuity of all its adherents, can never free it. Let it, now be taken for granted, that this doctrine is true—that every christian believes it, and that it has not one single opponent in the world; what would the result be? Just, what it was in the time of Cromwell; when, men could fight and sing psalms, pray and bitterly curse their enemies, clamour for liberty of conscience and deny it, to all who differed from them. It would just be, as it was in the days of Wesley and Fletcher, when, prejudice, bigotry, spiritual pride, sourness of spirit, refined metaphysical subtleties, long-winded harangues on speculative points; and even arguments over the sparkling cup respecting doctrine, charaterised thousands of this creed; who, while, living in sin with unconverted and unsanctified hearts, fancied themselves the elect of God! The writings and labours of Wesley, and the checks of Fletcher, struck the monster antinomianism to the ground; and while, it has almost expired among its former friends, hundreds of our Irish clergy with the Darbyites, who are the legitimate offspring of Church Calvinism, have nourished it into life again; so that, in opposition to the liturgy and articles, it has found its way into the pulpits of our churches, and the leaven of dissent is spreading on a large scale, through the agency of men, who are supported by her revenues. Let us, however, recur to the point in hand. What is the import and result of this doctrine? once in grace always in it. Let the following remarks constitute the reply.

1. Lot was an elect, he had grace once; therefore, he was a child of God, when he was guilty of incest. David was an elect, he had grace once; therefore, when, he killed Uriah and committed adultery with Bethsheba, he was just as much the child of God, then, as he was before. Solomon was an elect, he had grace once; and hence, when, following after every sensual pleasnre; and even, in the act of worshipping Ashtorath, he was, then, a child of God. Peter was an elect, he had grace once; and therefore, when, he denied Christ with oaths and curses, he was as much the child of God, as when, he confessed him. Judas was an elect, he had grace once, and why was he not also a child of God, when, he denied Christ and hanged himself?

2. If this doctrine be true; it evidently follows, that incest, adultery, murder, polygamy, idolatry, infidelity, lies, cursing and blas-

phemy are no crimes in the elect—that, they have an indulgence to sin; and consequently, that the natural tendency, of the doctrine of infallible perseverance, is to unholiness. This is all we want to prove; for in proving this, it is evident, the doctrine cannot be of God; it is not "according to godliness."

3. The scriptures are decisive against this vile antinomianism. "The soul that sineth shall die. The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness. The wages of sin is death—The carnal mind is enmity against God—Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, &c. shall inherit the kingdom of God. Let no man (not even the minister of the parish) deceive you with vain words; for because of these things cometh the wrath of God on the children of disobedience. Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not. He that committeth sin is of the devil. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin. Little children let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous even as he is righteous. In this the children of God, and the children of the devil are manifest"

4. Who can reconcile the case of Lot, David, Solomon, &c. with these scriptures? The thing is impossible. Each was a child of wrath by his sin, forfeited the favour of God, and became liable to perdition. The above scriptures make no distinction between sin committed before and after conversion. The principal part of them, though universal in their application, were written to those, who were, then, the elect of God. The doctrine of infallible perseverance and security destroys their meaning, strength, and moral influence. It sets up a secret, physical energy, in opposition to the morality and influence of the scriptures, and the spirit, who inspired them. It thereby destroys them, as the standard of holiness; and hence, leads to deception and falsehood. If Lot, David, and Solomon had believed in the impossibility of falling from grace; it is manifest, they claimed their privilege and sinned against God. What influence then, could the warnings and threatnings of God have in exciting them to return, when, they were perfectly secure, by a secret decree? If they did not know this doctrine; then, how could God, who was absolutely sure of their final salvation, threaten them with a death, which, he knew, could never possibly be their portion? How could David say, by the inspiration of the spirit, in a solemn assembly, as his last charge to his son? "And thou Solomon my Son, know thou the God of thy fathers, and serve him with a perfect

heart and with a willing mind: for the Lord searcheth all hearths, and understandeth all the imaginations of the thoughts: *if thou seek him, he will be found of thee; but if thou forsake him, he will cast thee off for ever.*" 1 Chron. xxviii. 9. If Solomon could not forsake God finally; it is impossible to reconcile the threat of casting him off for *ever*, with sincerity in God. The denial, of this possibility, not only, tarnishes the truth of God; but destroys the distinction between sin and holiness, renders God a respector of persons in reference even to sin, (for sin is sin according to this doctrine in the non-elect,) and opens a door for the commission of any or every crime, in conjunction with the favour of God and everlasting life! Have not those, who acknowledge that a man may finally fall, a decided scriptural and reasonable advantage, over those, who deny it? Let the candid judge.

IV. This *doctrine* is *repugnant to* and *undermines* the *scriptural doctrine* of *salvation* by *faith*. This charge may appear novel; but the question is, is it capable of proof? How is it possible, that those, who talk so much about faith, preach it, contend for it, glory in it, and despise all other professors, as defective in their views, of this grand, scriptural doctrine, should themselves render it void, and destroy its instrumentality in the salvation of man? Let us candidly examine this point; and it will appear, as clear as noon day, that, while popery by its merit of works, its penances, and its purgatory attacks it grossly and wickedly, on the one side; antinomianism, or the Calvinistic doctrine of final perseverance, insidiously, and darkly smites it, with the utmost profession of friendship on the otherr. It does this by two ways.

1. By substituting the mere belief of a creed, in place of the pure, operative and lively faith of the gospel, which appropriates the merits of Christ and interests its possessor, in the benefits, of Christ's redemption. This is universally the case, under all those ministrations, where, Calvinism is preached with fiery antinomian zeal; the witness and the fruits of the spirit may be mentioned, but not enforced; the doctrine of repentance is not heard of until justification is obtained; and the faith, that justifies in this school, is not that, which springs from an humble and penitent heart; it is not that, which takes no rest but in the blood of Christ; but a faith that embraces the sweet doctrine of electing love, the imputation of Christ's righteousness, or what is termed, his finished work, and that settles down in the belief, that the individual is one of the happy number. Here, then, is a high state of grace. He or she can never fall away. The character, it is said, may alter, but the state never can, viz., the

person may commit sin, but while the faith is retained, salvation is secure. Frames and feelings are now despised, and the newly elected person sits as a queen, knows no sorrow, smiles at the mutability of doubters, sneers at Wesleyan Methodism, as a dark, pernicious system, and while gazing through the vista of futurity, spies Mahomed's paradise in the distance and mistaking it for the kingdom of the Millenium, rejoices to think that the redeemer is just at hand, to elevate his long depressed people! Now, is this likeness distorted? Let the sober minded and observant only judge. The evil now exists; it has wound its snaky length into the bosom of thousands throughout the land. This counterfeit faith is passing current, for the truth; and the faith, which justifies the soul, purifies the heart, works by love, and not by prejudice and party spirit, is overlooked. The party so highly favoured, it is very true can never fall. They have no evidence to lose, no doubts to overcome; and while, their imagination and belief retain their seat, it is impossible, they should lose their grace! The fact, however, is evident; that they are enemies to the scriptural doctrine of salvation, from sin here, and from the wrath to come, by the substantial faith of the gospel.

2. This doctrine of final perseverance, as taught by Calvinists, saps the doctrine of faith in another way. For even those, who do preach that the faith should be lively and operative—that it must be accompanied with the inward and outward fruits of the spirit, shift it away from its scriptural position, by teaching the doctrine of infallible perseverance. There is no sentiment more capable of a scriptural demonstration, in all its fulness, than this—*salvation is by faith from beginning to end.* Faith is the condition of the new covenant. With it, there is salvation from sin and wrath; without it, there is none. "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned. He that believeth in the Son hath everlasting life; he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him. By grace ye are saved through faith. Without faith it is impossible to please God. Ye are *all* the *children* of *God* by *faith* in *Christ Jesus.*" From these scriptures, which express the entire sense of divine revelation on the subject, it is indisputably plain, that before a man believes, he is neither entitled to, nor enjoys salvation, either from guilt or wrath; and on the very same principle, if a man ceases to believe, there is no salvation for him; and hence, it follows, that the doctrine of infallible perseverance, by holding out salvation, to one who has lost his faith, and its fruits in his heart, is an unscriptural doctrine, and contrary to that of salvation by faith. Hereby, faith is dishonoured, although,

it is the only instrument of salvation, appointed by God himself. Is the individual, who has fallen from grace into sin, now the child of God, or not? If he be; then, God has elect children without faith; and the condition of the new covenant is of no value, sin is not the accursed thing, and even unbelief is not damning; the evidence of our acceptance is of no importance, and antinomianism, in its grossest form, is the natural result of the doctrine of perseverance. If the person now fallen be not a child of God; if by losing his faith, he has lost his adoption and meetness for heaven along with it, it follows, of course, that he is now under the curse of God, that he is liable to perish everlastingly, and this is all for which we contend. If he be liable to perish, the doctrine of final perseverance, in the Calvinistic sense, is sacrificed in the acknowledgment; and, if he be not subject to perish, he must remain in the favour of God, and the doctrine of salvation by faith, is immolated at the shrine of infallible perseverance. On the horn of this dilemma, we now hang the subject in question, leaving it as a gordion knot, which may be cut by the rashness of the ignorant, while, it cannot be loosed by the wisdom of the instructed. True indeed! in this case, there are two strong holds into which sophistry runs to screen this backslider, and render his state secure—the *imputation* of *Christ's righteousness*, and the *secret decree* of *predestination* to *life*. But where do we find either of these mentioned in the scriptures? Neither one phrase or the other is found in the Bible. The word *predestination* is not even honoured with a *place* in the *whole record* of *revelation;* and Dr. Dwight has the candour to acknowledge the term *decree*, is not applied in the Hebrew scriptures to any *general system* of *determinations*. Shall we permit Calvinism then, to screen the backslider from a liability to perish, behind unscriptural phrases? Shall one battery of error be thus raised to defend another? Let us, however, keep to the point; and we will still discover, that these strongholds are built on the ruins of the doctrine of salvation by faith.

1. As it regards the imputation of Christ's righteousness, in this instance, it stands directly repugnant to the doctrine of salvation from sin, by faith, in the blood of Christ. This backslider is guilty of murder and adultery with David, and of denying Christ with Peter. Hence, he has no faith, and yet he is covered with the spotless robe of the redeemer's righteousness; he is all pure and holy in Christ! Still he is a child of God without faith, as much so, as when he enjoyed and exercised it. This is a direct departure from the doctrine of salvation by faith. This point will appear still stronger, when we simply glance at the scriptural doctrine of impu-

tation. "Abraham believed God, and *it* was *imputed* for *righteousness*. To him that worketh not, but *believeth* on him that justifieth the ungodly, *his faith* is *imputed* for *righteousness*." This is the only doctrine of imputed righteousness mentioned in the scriptures. But the backslider of whom we speak, has lost his faith; therefore, he *has nothing* now to *be imputed* for *righteousness*. Hence, he is *unrighteous* in the sight of God. And what saith the Apostle? 1 Cor. vi. 9. "Know ye not that the *unrighteous* shall not inherit the kingdom of God. Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, &c. shall inherit the kingdom of God." From these remarks, it is evident, that Calvinistic imputation is contrary to the doctrine of salvation by faith, to the imputation of faith for righteousness, to the moral law; and, in fact, to the whole scheme, both of law and gospel. It is the mere figment of an antinomian imagination —a counterfeit of truth—a refuge of lies; and of course, in this case, can form no covering for the man, who has departed from the faith.

2. Respecting the decree of God, we will just come to the same conclusion, as it regards this man, who has fallen from purity into adultery, from love into murder, and from faith into a denial of his Lord and master. Being one of the elect; it was decreed before all worlds, that, he should be brought to everlasting life. Hence, he was, is, and always must be the child of God. For, if he be the child of God, by this decree, after he has lost faith; on the same principle, he must have been his child before he had any. Here the doctrine of salvation by faith is discarded again. The Apostle is set at defiance afresh, when, he declares: "Ye are all the children of God by *faith* in Christ Jesus." If it be conceded, that a man is not a child of God, until, he believes; then, it must be acknowledged, that, when, he ceases to believe, or denies Christ, he ceases to be a child of God. Again, if it be asserted, that after losing faith, he remains a child of God, no matter what sins he may commit, by virtue of the decree; it follows of course, that, he must have been a child of God before he believed at all: and hence, faith is made void; and that by the party, who are for ever extolling its virtues; but then, they may mean faith in the decree; whereas, the faith of the gospel is faith lively, active and vigorous, apprehending and resting on the atoning blood.

But, here, it may be asserted, that, the backslider is decreed yet to believe, and to be restored, because God has decreed the means with the end. If so; why did he not decree this man to *keep* the *faith* and *never lose it* for an *instant*? Would not this have contributed

more to his glory? The man is now guilty of murder, adultery, and a denial of Christ—"he is blind and cannot see afar off and has even forgotten that he was purged from his old sins." 2 Pet. i. 9. Why did not God decree, that he should not commit those things? The fact is he did so: for, his adultery and murder are forbidden by the law, and his unbelief by the gospel. Here, then, is God's decree revealed in his word; and the man has resisted and broken this, and by it, he is doomed to perdition, as an adulterer, murderer, and unbeliever. "Cursed is he that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them. He that believeth not shall be damned. If we deny him, he will deny us." But Calvinism has a secret decree—one nurtured in the imagination, and it sets aside the revealed decree—stands directly opposed to it, and disannuls all its threats, If the one be true, therefore, the other must be false. To which of them shall we adhere? To the God of the scriptures, whose decree is revealed, or to the God of the imagination, whose decree is secret? Again, if by the decree of God, the man obtained faith and was saved from sin before, and if by the same decree, he is to believe again, and be saved from iniquity in future; it is not unfair to enquire, why he is now in a state of unbelief and sin? If it be said, he resisted the decree and fell? then, he may resist again and never rise, and of course perish for ever. This, however, will not do; for thereby, the inefficacy of the decree is acknowledged; it must, therefore, have been incapable of resistance. If so; it is evident his fall did not arise from himself; and hence, God is the primary author of his sin, by withdrawing the influence of his decree? We come, then, to this conclusion—that by the revealed decree, his sin was forbidden, and by the secret one it was effected. Such are the absurd results of this ridiculous doctrine! Examine it in every possible form; and we end in absurdity and in a denial of the plain, scriptural doctrine of salvation by faith.

V. We are, now, to notice a few of the popular objections and phrases, that are brought forward to support infallible perseverance. When scriptural arguments fail, assertion and sophism often supply their place. It is our duty, however, to notice those, that are considered important.

1. The first we attend to is this; "the believers *character* may *alter* but his *state never can*." We have only to find out the import of this sentence, to ascertain the vile antinomianism, it contains. Squeeze it and you will find it to be one of the grapes of Sodom. State here refers to condition, to the relation in which a believer stands to God, as his child, freed from condemnation and entitled to

eternal life. Character has reference as to his tempers, words, and actions; for by these, he exhibits the inward qualities and graces of the heart, as communicated by the spirit of God. What now is the import of this antinomian proverb? That the believer may lose his faith, the witness and fruits of the spirit—that, he may indulge in evil tempers; such as fretfulness, murmuring, envy, malice, revenge, hatred—that, he may give way to obscene, lying, bitter, and unholy words—that, he may be guilty of idolatry, image worship, blasphemy, sabbath breaking, disobedience to parents, murder, adultery, theft, perjury, and covetousness—in fact, that, his character may alter, so that, he violates every precept of the law, and every command of the gospel; and yet, his condition remains unaltered, being still a child of God, under no condemnation, and entitled to eternal life! Such is the juice of this grape, which is swallowed by the dear children of the Lord in the present day. It amounts to the same thing as to say, that, when, Satan sinned in heaven, he did not lose, but kept his first estate—that, when, Adam sinned in paradise, he did not lose Eden, but always was entitled to it—that, when, Judas betrayed Christ he was under no condemnation, but entitled to eternal life, because, he was once a believer—that, when, Hymenæus and Alexander lost a good conscience, and made shipwreck of faith; they were still children of God, and entitled to a seat in glory—that, when, he who was once enlightened—once tasted of the heavenly gift—once partook of the Holy Ghost—fell so far away, that, he crucified Christ afresh, and put him to an open shame, he was just as *secure* in the midst of his unbelief, blasphemy, and wickedness, as he was, when, he tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come! Such is the dark nucleus enclosed in this bright sentiment, which, by its horid glare, dazzles the eyes of thousands, and prevents them from seeing the simple truth of the word of God. "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins; but a certain, fearful looking for of judgment, and of fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries. Heb. x. 26. 27. Here is both an alteration of character and of condition.

2. It is triumphantly asked, "How can a man be a child of God to day, and a child of the devil to-morrow?" This is considered perfectly absurd; and constitutes one of those flippant questions, which often answers the end of shifting the subject from its true, scriptural ground. Let us examine it a little. According to Calvins decree, it stands thus: How can a man be absolutely elected to eternal life to day, and be subject to eternal death to-morrow?

Here is the ground and sentiment of question. This is the proper meaning of it in the mind of the proposer; but, as the decree has no existence, except, in the imagination, the question, itself, is absurd and unscriptural. According to the revealed word of God, it appears thus: How can a man believe to-day and not to-morrow? How can he avoid sin to-day, and commit it to-morrow? To these queries the answer is ready—that as Satan was an angel of light at a certain period, and became a devil by his sin—that as Adam was the child of God on the first day of his creation, but by his sin became the child of the devil, for ought we know on the next day; so a believer by wilful sin may fall, and ceasing to be the child of God, become the child of Satan. "He that committeth sin," saith the Apostle John, "is of the devil." And surely those, who say, that sin cannot be destroyed in this life, will not deny the possibility of a believer committing sin. If this be granted, then, the question is solved at once; for the possibility of committing sin necessarily implies, on the part of a believer, the possibility of becoming a child of the devil. Let the believer commit sin, and he becomes the servant of sin; and is of his father the devil, whose work he does.

3. Another popular argument is this, that, "if Christ lost any member, that once belonged to him, it would disfigure his body." This, however, will appear in its true light by a few observations. Christ is the head; the church is the body. This *figure* is scriptural. The human body from which the figure is derived, would be disfigured by the loss of a particular member; but does it follow from thence, that the mystical or spiritual body of Christ, would be subject to the same unseemliness by the loss of one, or even of a hundred? Does not the church of Christ above consist of a multitude, which no man could number? Would the want of one or of ten, who once enjoyed the same spirit and union with them, disfigure the multitude, and make the number incomplete? Is it not better, even to have the human body disfigured, than to retain a corrupt member, which either stops the current of circulation, or being liable to mortify, is in danger of bringing death on the whole body? "Know ye not that your bodies are the *members* of *Christ*? Shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot?" 1 Cor. vi. 15. The verb *take*, here, implies to *bear up*, or *remove away*. The fornicator cannot inherit Christ's kingdom, and surely he cannot belong to Christ's body. Those who do must have Christ's spirit. "For if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Rom. viii. 9. "And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." Gal. v. 24. Hence, the

backslider, who commits adultery as David did, or denies his Lord like Peter, does not belong to Christ's body. Is not the body then disfigured? If so, for a time; why may it not remain so for ever? "Hold that fast which thou hast," saith Jesus to the Church of Philadelphia, "that no man take thy crown." Is it not plain from these words, that if one member be lost, another is ready to fill his place? When Christ lost Judas, Matthias got his office, crown and throne. If the fallen believer cannot be cut off from Christ, why does he command him to be cut off from the union of his church in this world? If he retains his sonship, and his title to the heavenly inheritance, why should he be deprived of the outward privileges of the visible church? Is *it* purer than the Church above? See the inconsistency which characterises this doctrine in every thing. In conclusion let our Lord himself reply. "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away." "Impossible! saith Antinomianism, "quite impossible! for that would disfigure Christ the true vine." The dispute on this point, now, rests between Christ and the Father, on the one hand, and the antinomian doctrine of infallible perseverance on the other. Let the reader choose, which, he will believe.

4. The last argument of this class which we notice is this: "As no one under any circumstances, or by any conduct of his own, can ever cease to be the son of his natural father; so no believer can ever cease to be the son or child of God." This argument would be irresistible and unanswerable only for one thing;—it is *not true*. This is certainly a capital defect in any argument. But, wherein, is the defect? A few remarks will shew it to be false and absurd. 1. All angels good and bad, and all men righteous and wicked are the natural offspring, and according to this argument, children of God. "Have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us? Mal. ii. 10. Hence, as no one can cease to be the son of his natural father, so devils and the spirits of wicked men can never cease to be the natural children of God. 2. It is evident beyond all doubt, that God has disinherited multitudes of his children by nature—that, he has cast them off, and subjected them to eternal misery, on account of their disobedience; and as the argument proceeds on this ground, why should he not cast off and punish the disobedient believer? Is he not one of his children by nature? Did not God create him? 3. The believer is not only his child by nature, but also by *grace* and *adoption*. This constitutes a new and different kind of sonship. Here, then, the analogy is lost; for although, it is

impossible for a son to cease being the natural son of his father, or for Satan to cease to be the child of God by creation; it does not follow, but the believer may lose his sonship, seeing it is by grace and adoption. 4. A man becomes the son of his natural father, without any condition; and continues in that relation, necessarily and unconditionally, but a believer becomes the son of God on condition, that, he believes in Jesus Christ; and retains his sonship only by holding fast the faith, walking in love, and obeying the commands of his heavenly Father. Hence, it follows, that, if the condition be not fulfilled, the relationship ceases, and the man is no longer a child of God. 5. If the son, by nature, such as Satan and Adam, be disinherited by disobedience; it is equally agreeable to reason, that, the son, by grace and adoption, should share the same fate; if by his disobedience, he despises the high and holy blessings, which, he received by grace and adoption. The word of eternal truth confirms this view. It matters not, whether, a man be called the child of God or not; whether, the prodigal, while ready to perish, be designated by an honourable or dishonourable name, the inheritance is forfeited by unholy conduct, and the misery is increased by losing the benefits of sonship. Israel was called the son of God, and yet he fell in the wilderness by unbelief, and did not inherit the holy land. Our Lord declares, that, "the children of the kingdom shall be cast out." We are only to be finally partakers of Christ and his inheritance, "if we hold fast the beginning of the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope, firm unto the end." "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who *hath trodden* under *foot* the *Son* of *God*, and hath *counted* the *blood* of the *covenant*, wherewith *he was sanctified*, an *unholy thing*, and *hath done despite* unto the *spirit* of *grace?*"

THE END.

Cork: S. M. Thompson, 18, Great George's Street.

THE DOCTRINE

OF

ELECTION AND REPROBATION

OPENED AND EXPLAINED:

BEING THE

SUBSTANCE OF A LECTURE,

DELIVERED BY REQUEST,

IN THE INDEPENDENT CHAPEL, AT AIRDRIE,

On the Evening of Wednesday, January the 20th, 1841.

BY THE

REV. JOHN SIMON, GLASGOW.

PUBLISHED AT THE REQUEST OF A NUMBER OF THOSE WHO HEARD IT DELIVERED.

GLASGOW:
PUBLISHED BY CHARLES WEST, 156, HIGH STREET.
1841.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

CHAP. I.

Preliminary Remarks, ... 9

CHAP. II.

The Calvinistic View of the Doctrine, ... 12

CHAP. III.

Points of Agreement and Disagreement on the Doctrine of Election and Reprobation, ... 25

CHAP. IV.

An Examination of those Scriptures which are generally insisted upon by the Calvinists to Prove and Establish the Doctrine of Eternal, Personal, and Unconditional Election and Reprobation, . . 27

CHAP. V.

A Brief Analysis of the Epistle to the Romans, ... 34

CHAP. VI.

Same Subject continued, ... 39

CHAP. VII.

Same Subject continued, ... 44

CHAP. VIII.

Calvinistic Election and Reprobation at variance with the right and proper meaning of the terms Election and Reprobation, . . . 67

CHAP. IX.

Reasons for Rejecting the Calvinian Doctrine of Election and Reprobation, ... 76

TO THE

ZEALOUS, PIOUS, AND WORTHY LEADERS AND MEMBERS OF THE WESLEYAN SOCIETY, IN AIRDRIE.

My Dear Brethren,

Mercy unto you, and peace, and love be multiplied.

The great Apostle of the Gentiles, when writing on the important duty which every Christian is bound to discharge in relation to the great truths of the Gospel, exhorted the saints in his days "earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints." This mighty contest to which they were urged by this high authority, embodies the fact, that they were earnestly to contend for the purity of the faith against the mutilating and corrupting glossaries that were then attempted to be put on it by vain philosophers and Judaising teachers. No less binding is this injunction on ourselves in these days. The principle contained in the injunction has been exemplified by you, my Brethren, on the occasion which gave rise and existence to the remarks contained in the following pages. Attempts have been recently made in your own neighbourhood, to revive the doctrine of personal election and reprobation, by a series of discourses preached in your parish, on the Calvinistic doctrines; and, among the rest that were delivered on that occasion, one has been printed and circulated, advocating (in its way) the doctrine of personal, unconditional election and reprobation. In this production the truth of God has been misrepresented: and you conceived that some poor soul might have been led astray thereby; hence

your united and urgent request, pressed by you to the author to deliver a Lecture on the Scriptural view of the subject. Having complied with your request in that instance, you farther requested the publication of those remarks in a more extended form: and considering your zeal for the glory of God, and your attachment and love of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, together with the fact, that God did bless the delivering of the said lecture, by making it instrumental in saving, at least, one soul; and that the reading of the same may produce the same, and still more abundant success, I have ventured to comply: though, in consequence of a press of other business, I have been long in meeting your wish in this respect, and I have to crave indulgence at your hands for the delay. But, my dear Brethren, be assured the above is the only reason. However, you have succeeded in getting me out of my favourite solitude and privacy, into the world and before its complex opinioned public, and that in connection with a highly controversial subject. And it is now for the public to decide and judge how much wisdom you have displayed in the request you have made, and how much judgment I had in complying. I have throughout the whole endeavoured to speak and write as a Minister of the peaceable Gospel of the meek and lowly Jesus. My aim was truth, and is still. This I value, as you do likewise, more than the favour and friendship of all the men in the world. And highly as we value those men, and we do esteem them very highly for their work' sake who differ from us in their views of the subject discussed in these pages, still, we value the truth more. Principles, and not men, has been our motto. And as it regards the class or classes of readers, I own that these will continue to exercise their judgment on the subject, as their predecessors have done. That is, some will approach this subject with their mind previously made up. The proposition is already fixed in the mind of such men, and every passage they read is made to coincide with their views. They do not stoop to the dictates of Scripture and reason, but they make Scripture and reason stoop to them. I have therefore very little to say to this class. They deserve compassion, because they shut out of their minds the noble and sublime truths of the Gospel. May

God give them a better mind, and a good understanding in all things. There is another class that have brought prayer to God, and untiring application to the search and study of the Bible and other good books, and have thereby obtained correct views of theology. This class will at once see what may be defective in argument, or deficient in illustration, in these pages, and, without noise or clamour, will supply the defect as they proceed. There are those again, who take almost every thing for granted, and will give themselves very little trouble about these disputed points. Is it not expressly laid down upon us as a duty, to "prove all things?" This careless indifference is therefore a crime which ought not to be repeated. Let those persons read carefully the arguments advanced on both sides, and judge for themselves, and the God of truth will lead them to all his truth, and make it efficacious in the salvation of their souls. This, in every class, and in every instance, is the prayer of,

DEAR BRETHREN,

Your most humble and obedient

Servant in Christ,

J. SIMON.

GLASGOW,
May 25, 1841.

THE DOCTRINE

OF

ELECTION AND REPROBATION

OPENED AND EXPLAINED,

&c.

"For the children being not yet born, neither having done good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth; it was said unto her, the elder shall serve the younger, as it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated."—Rom. ix. 11—13.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

The doctrine which the text is supposed to contain is that of personal, eternal, and unconditional election and reprobation; one to life everlasting, and the other to endless wo! This also is supposed to have been unalterably done in the counsels of eternity by the Almighty God, without any foresight or regard to the faith of one, nor to the obstinate unbelief of the other. And all the extraordinary transaction is resolved to one only principle, and that principle is said to be "God's Sovereign Will and Pleasure!" But before we come to state and illustrate the doctrine really contained in the text—which will be done in our analysis of this epistle—we must observe, that the doctrine of election and reprobation has been very keenly and ably discussed and disputed for some years past. Men of rare and extraordinary talents are found arranged on both sides of the question. And each party, notwithstanding the wide and irreconcilable difference that exists in their respective theories on the point in debate, appeal to the "word of God" for proof and illustration. This makes it very difficult for the unlearned to decide in their own mind, and thereby arrive at a proper and

correct conclusion in relation to the disputed point. Still there may be, for aught that appears to the contrary, some good resulting from these opposite views that have been taken and entertained on this subject. Such as an inducement for men to call into exercise a spirit of inquiry and examination in themselves,—a more careful, steady, and deeper investigation of the language of Holy Writ,—prayer to Almighty God for the aid of his Spirit to conduct them

"To the height of this great argument,"

in order that they may properly, clearly, and fully

. . "Assert eternal providence,
And justify the ways of God to men."

These, and such like exertions, may be regarded as presumptive evidence of the good that may, and often does, emanate from contrary theories and opposite opinions, entertained and expressed upon theological subjects.

But there are also many and dangerous evils that necessarily result from the Calvinian view of this controversy. These are, the depriving of an immense number of the human family of all hope of salvation, by telling them, (as will be shown presently,) in plain and unambiguous terms, "that they are reprobated from all eternity, and must therefore be damned, do what they will." There is also an opening, (though not designed on the part of our Calvinistic brethren,) of several refuges for sinners to flee into; and thereby delay their conversion to God, by resisting in these refuges of lies, (to which they are taught by Calvinism to flee,) the operations of the Holy Ghost on their hearts. For when present salvation is offered on the terms, and in the spirit of the Bible, this doctrine has taught sinners the way to refuse the whole at that time, and that on the supposition and belief that "God's good time to call and save them has not yet come." Procrastination is therefore the dire result. In this way conversions to God are delayed—the progress of Christianity in the world impeded—and an excuse given to every sinner for omission of duty, and for the commission of every sin, however bold, daring, flagitious, and abominable the crime may be. And this is not all, for Calvinism exerts a mighty influence—and that of a very baneful nature—on the mind and disposition of its votaries. In many instances it makes them gloomy, dull, and morose; vindictive and implacable towards those who venture to differ from

them on religious subjects. In proof and illustration of this, we need only instance the conduct of Calvin himself towards Michael Servetus, whom he prosecuted as an heretic, for a difference of opinion on the doctrine of the Trinity, and some other points. He was, however, at Calvin's instigation, condemned to die, and was burned alive with *moist green wood ! ! !* We might also bring forward the conduct of the Calvinistic divines at, and after, the famous Synod of Dort, when the Remonstrants, as the Arminians were then called, were so dreadfully persecuted by their Calvinistic brethren, and that for no moral or civil crime whatever, either implied or alleged, save merely differing in opinion on a few religious points ! These, and many more similar effusions of an uncharitable disposition, which high Calvinism appears to gender in the hearts of its abettors, are proofs of its bad effects. We do not, however, intend in this place to dwell on the extreme inconsistency of our Calvinistic brethren in the instances adduced. It might have been the fact, that all these persons persecuted by them were the elect of God. If so, why their persecution *by their brethren ?* And if not the elect, but the long hated, and still hateful reprobates, in that case, they had no need of prosecuting and burning them to death, for, according to their own doctrinal showing, God would, in his own good time, infallibly have turned them all to hell ! !

We must, however, remark, that we hold many, nevertheless, of those who both embrace and propagate these views, in admiration, on account of their piety and zeal in the cause of God, together with their high and splendid talents, profound learning, and much usefulness in the Church and in the world. We can thus discriminate between theory and practice. The one we detest; the other we admire. We go hand in hand with our respected brethren in their laudable efforts to promote the welfare of our fellow-men; and at the same time conscientiously differ from them in our views of personal, eternal, and unconditional election and reprobation. We are one in heart and one in effort to save sinners. The difference exists in theological opinions. When we have made these preliminary observations, we shall pass on to lay before you the doctrine of election and reprobation, as it is taught, and doubtless believed, by the Calvinists themselves.

CHAP. II.

THE CALVINISTIC VIEW OF THE DOCTRINE.

As the book entitled "The Confession of Faith" is a legally authenticated document, and forms the standard of doctrine as well as of discipline among the Calvinists in general, we shall therefore proceed to lay before you the doctrine as it is found in that document. And we thus read: "God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; yet so, as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established.

"II. Although God knows whatsoever may or can come to pass on all supposed conditions; yet hath he not decreed any thing because he foresaw it as future, or as that which would come to pass upon such conditions.

"III. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated into everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.

"IV. These angles and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished.

"V. Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes moving him thereunto; and all to the praise of his glorious grace.

"VI. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore, they who are elected being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ; are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his Spirit working in due season: are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually

called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only.

"VII. The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice.

"VIII. The doctrine of this high mystery of predestination is to be handled with special prudence and care, that men attending the will of God revealed in his word, and yielding obedience thereunto, may, from the certainty of their effectual vocation, be assured of their eternal election. So shall this doctrine afford matter of praise, reverence, and admiration of God, and of humility, diligence, and abundant consolation, to all that sincerely obey the gospel."*

Again, let us turn to the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and we shall see that the doctrine is one and the same.

"*Quest.* 12. What are the decrees of God?

"*Ans.* God's decrees are, the wise, free, and holy acts of the counsel of his will, whereby from all eternity, he hath, for his own glory, unchangeably foreordained whatsoever comes to pass in time, especially concerning angels and men."

"*Quest.* 13. What hath God especially decreed concerning angels and men?

"*Ans.* God, by an eternal and immutable decree, out of his mere love, for the praise of his glorious grace; to be manifested in due time, hath elected some angels to glory; and in Christ hath chosen some men to eternal life, and the means thereof; and also according to his sovereign power and the unsearchable counsel of his own will, (whereby he extendeth or withholdeth favour as he pleaseth,) hath passed by and foreordained the rest to dishonour and wrath, to be for their sin inflicted, to the praise of the glory of his justice."†

Again, in the Shorter Catechism, in answer to

"*Quest.* 7. What are the decrees of God?

"*Ans.* The decrees of God are his eternal purpose, according to the counsel of his will, whereby, for his own glory, he hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass."

Thus have we fairly stated the doctrine from the Confession of Faith, and that without the slightest alteration in any part of it;

* Confession of Faith, chap. iii. pp. 38—42.

† Ibid. pp. 184, 185.

nor have we introduced a single word in the quotations made, of illustrative remark. But, as those living divines, who profess firmly to believe this as a solid scriptural truth, often give us so many of their own glossaries explanatory of this point; particularly, when they offer salvation to *all men;* and when they tell their congregations "that not one will be eternally lost, unless they wilfully exclude themselves from offered mercy," &c., let us enter a little farther into the arcana of Calvinism, and thereby satisfy ourselves with the facts of the case as they really are. Nothing, however, can be plainer than this, that, in the standard of doctrine which forms the basis of all Calvinistic theology nearly, the doctrine of personal, unconditional, and eternal election and reprobation is most unequivocally taught. And our respected opponents cannot certainly blame us for quoting from their own standard and approved authors. And great care shall be taken in showing you what the doctrine really is, as taught in these documents. For the way in which this doctrine of personal, unconditional, and eternal election and reprobation is interpreted by its respectable advocates in pulpit discourses and public ministrations, has a tendency to mislead the simple and unsuspecting; for we are almost constantly told in this way, "that though God did certainly elect his own people from all eternity, and that he did as certainly pass by the rest of mankind, and foreordain them to sin, and then to eternal wrath, still, he did not make their state any worse than it was made by their own sin," &c.; which statements too often lead to the conclusion, in the mind of sinners, that their damnation is purely and exclusively their own wilful act and deed—which cannot be possibly the case, if the Calvinian scheme be true. In order to see more clearly the truth of this assertion, let us put the question in this plain and simple form. Can any one be saved that has not been elected? The answer is, certainly not; because, in order to actual salvation, there must have been redemption and effectual calling. This is the answer and the legitimate reason assigned. But we must ask again, can any one be redeemed that has not been previously elected? The answer, of necessity, must be the same as in the former case. No one can have been redeemed by the blood of Christ unless previously elected by the Father. Then the fact is, the whole body of the reprobates, according to this scheme, (the Calvinian,) are not elected, nor redeemed, and, therefore, cannot be effectually called. They are totally left without any remedy whatever. Then, let us inquire further, is it possible for any one to be put in possession of salvation without the effectual calling? The answer, of course, must be, no.

Not one can be saved but those elected, redeemed, and effectually called. We must now ask, for what are the reprobates damned? For we have seen that God has passed them by; Christ has not died for them; the Holy Ghost will not, cannot effectually call them. There is no salvation prepared nor sincerely offered to them —the only Saviour in the world is denied to them—their damnation is fixed by the joint concurrence of the Trinity in the counsels of eternity! and, therefore, we seriously ask our Calvinistic brethren, for what in the whole world are the reprobates damned? Hear the reply: "They are damned for sins which the Almighty foreordained them to commit!! They are punished eternally for not believing!!!" For not believing what? What is there for them to believe in? Let our revered brethren answer, for I really cannot. If they believe the truth, and if this be the truth, they must believe that they are reprobates, and that without any previous sins of their own constituting them such; for they were made so many ages before they were born! Can they be saved by believing this? or are they to be damned eternally for not believing in such a revolting dogma? Plainly, they have nothing else to believe in, if Calvinism be true. If they believe that they are elected and redeemed, they must, on this hypothesis, most assuredly believe a lie! Without proceeding farther in this strain, let us hear what Mr. John Calvin, Piscator, and others of the same school, have uttered on this point. And in order to put their views in the most intelligible and clear light, we shall assume the colloquial style, just for that purpose, and so introduce their opinions in the form of a dialogue, carried on between two parties—the one Arminus and the other Calvin. Arminus shall therefore begin the conversation.

Arminus. My opinion is, Sir, that you make God the author of all sin, and the destroyer of the greatest part of mankind.

Calvin. No, no. I only say, that "God did, from all eternity, unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass;" and that it is false to say, "that God does not stand in need of sin, for it is necessary to the manifestation of his glory; and that, therefore, God created man with a design that he should fall, since otherwise he could not attain his end."*

Arm. Do you make no exception?

Cal. Certainly not; "for nothing is more absurd than to think anything at all is done but by the ordination of God."†

* Shorter Catechism, Quest. 7th; Piscator in Resp. ad Apol., p. 44.

† Calvin's Institutes, Book I. chap. xvi. sec. 3.

Arm. Do you therefore intend this to extend to all the thoughts and actions of men?

Cal. Most assuredly I do, for "every action and motion of every creature is so governed by the hidden counsel of God, that nothing can come to pass but what was ordained by him."*

Arm. Upon this hypothesis, what becomes of the wills of men?

Cal. "The wills of men are so governed by the will of God, that they are carried on straight to the mark which he has fore-ordained."†

Arm. Do you not really mean by this the permissive will of God, that merely permits evil thoughts and actions to exist, and not ordain them?

Cal. No: I mean to say, in the most unequivocal language, that "all things come to pass by the efficacious and irresistible will of God."‡

"God is as much master of the human heart as he is of the elements. Every step of every individual character receives as determinate a character from the hand of God, as every mile of a planet's orbit, or every gust of wind, or every wave of the sea, or every particle of flying dust, or every rivulet of flowing water."§

Arm. Have the goodness to tell me, then, whether you place man, who is, doubtless, an intellectual being and a moral agent, on the same principle of government as you do mere inanimate matter?

Cal. Most decidedly I do, "for this power of God knows no exceptions. It is absolute and unlimited; and while it embraces the vast, it carries its resistless influence to all the minute and unnoticed diversities of existence—it reigns and operates through all the secrecies of the inner man—it gives birth to every purpose—it gives impulse to every desire—it gives shape and colour to every conception—it wields an entire ascendency over every attribute of the mind, and the will, and the fancy, and the understanding, with all the countless variety of their hidden and fugitive operations, are submitted to it. It gives movement and direction through every one point in the line of our pilgrimage; and at no one moment of time does it abandon us. It follows us to the hour of death,

* Calvin's Institutes, Book I. chap. xvi. sec. 3. † Ibid. sec. 8.

‡ Dr. Twiss' Vindication of the Grace, Power, and Providence of God, chap. iii. p. 19.

§ Dr. Chalmers' Sermon on Predestination.

and it carries us to our place and our everlasting destiny in the region beyond it."*

Arm. I now understand you; you mean then to say, that all men must do just what they do?

Cal. Precisely. "It is impossible that anything should ever be done but that to which God impels the will of man."†

"Let us not erect the will of the creature into an independent principle; let us not conceive that the agency of man can bring about one single iota of deviation from the plans and purposes of God."‡

Arm. This doctrine therefore implies the necessity of all events to occur precisely as they do occur?

Cal. "I will not scruple to own that the will of God lays a necessity on all things, and that everything he wills necessarily comes to pass."§

Arm. Does sin, therefore, necessarily come to pass?

Cal. Undoubtedly; for "the Almighty power of God extends itself to the first fall, and all other sins of angels and men."‖

Arm. I readily grant that God foresaw that Adam would fall.

Cal. Nay. "God not only foresaw that Adam would fall, but also ordained that he should."¶

Arm. I know that God permitted Adam's fall.

Cal. I tell you, "he fell not only by the permission, but also by the appointment of God."**

"He sinned because God so ordained—because the Lord saw good."††

Arm. But do not those who differ from you raise many objections against you as to this point?

Cal. Yes; "Those poisonous dogs vomit out many things against God. They deny that the Scripture says God decreed Adam's fall; they say he might have chose either to fall or not; and that God foreordained only to treat him according to his desert; as if God had created the noblest of all his creatures without foreordaining what should become of him."‡‡

* Ibid. pp. 309, 310. † Dr. Twiss' Vindication, &c. p. 19.

‡ Dr. Chalmers' Sermon.

§ Calvin's Institutes, Book III. chap. xxiv. sec. 8.

‖ Assembly's Catechism. ¶ Calvin's Institutes, Book III. chap xxiii. sec. 7.

** Calvini Responsio ad Calumnias, &c.

†† Calvin's Institutes, Book III. chap. xxiv. sec. 8.

‡‡ Ibid. Book III. chap. xxiii. sec. 2 & 7.

Arm. Did the Almighty therefore make Adam on purpose that he might fall?

Cal. Most assuredly he did. "God made Adam and Eve to this very purpose, that they might be tempted and led into sin. And, by force of his decree, it could not otherwise be but they must sin."*

Arm. But do you not ground God's decree on God's foreknowledge rather than his will?

Cal. No. "God forsees nothing but what he has decreed, and his decree precedes his knowledge."†

Arm. Well, this may truly be termed a horrible decree.

Cal. "I confess it is a horrible decree; yet no one can deny but God foreknew Adam's fall, and therefore foreknew it, because he had ordained it by his own decree."‡

Arm. Do you believe, then, that God has, by his own positive decree, not only elected some men to life, but also reprobated all the rest?

Cal. Most assuredly I do; for if I believe the one, I believe the other. "Many, indeed, (thinking to excuse God,) own election, and yet deny reprobation; but this is quite silly and childish, for without reprobation election itself cannot stand. Whom God passes by, those he reprobates."§

Arm. Will you now explain what you mean by election and reprobation?

Cal. With all my heart. What I mean is this, that "all men are not created for the same end,—some are foreordained to eternal life, others to eternal damnation. So, according as every man was created for the one end or the other, so we say he was elected or predestinated to destruction; and I tell you farther, that God hath, once for all, appointed, by an eternal and unchangeable decree, to whom he would give salvation, and whom he would devote to destruction."‖

Arm. Let me now ask you this plain question, that we may thereby perfectly understand one another. Did God Almighty make any man on purpose to be damned?

Cal. I have told you so plain enough already, and I will tell you again, that "God's first constitution was, that some should be

* Piscator's Disputations, p. 6. † Ibid. &c.

‡ Calvin's Institutes, Book III. chap. xxiii. sec. 7.

§ Ibid. Book III. chap. xxiii. sec. 1. ‖ Ibid. chap. xxi. sec. 1—7.

destined to eternal ruin; and to this end their sins were ordained, and denial of grace, in order to their sins."*

Arm. But is not God's predestinating men to life or death grounded on God's foreknowledge?

Cal. "So the vulgar think, that God, as he foresees every man will deserve, elects them to life, or devotes them to death and damnation."†

Arm. And do you not think that reprobation, at least, is grounded on God's foreknowing men's sins?

Cal. No, indeed; "God of his own good pleasure ordains that many should be born, who are from the womb devoted to inevitable damnation. If any man pretend that God's foreknowledge lays them under no necessity of being damned, but rather that he decreed their damnation because he foreknew their wickedness; I grant that God's foreknowledge alone lays no necessity on the creature; but eternal life and death depend on the will rather than the foreknowledge of God. If God only foreknew all things that relate to all men, and did not decree and ordain them also, then it might be inquired, whether or no his foreknowledge necessitates the thing foreknown. But seeing he therefore foreknows all things that will come to pass, it is vain to contend about foreknowledge, since it is plain all things come to pass by God's positive decree."‡

Arm. Now, if God has positively decreed to damn the greater part of mankind, why does he call upon them to repent, believe, and be saved?

Cal. "As God has his effectual call, whereby he gives the elect the salvation to which he ordained them, so he has his judgments towards the reprobates, whereby he executes his decrees concerning them. As many, therefore, as he created to live miserably, and then perish everlastingly; these, that they may be brought to the end for which they were created, he sometimes deprives of the possibility of hearing the word, and at other times, by the preaching thereof, blinds and stupifies them the more."§

Arm. If God has thus created them purposely for never-ending death and inevitable damnation, and thereby fixing, in the most secure manner, their doom, before they were born, why does he

* Zanchius de Natura Dei, pp. 553, 554.

† Calvin's Institutes, Book III. chap. xxii. sec. 1.

‡ Ibid. chap. xxiii. sec. 6.

§ Ibid. chap. xxiv. sec. 12.

call to them to turn and live, yea, even *command* them to repent and be saved?

Cal. I will tell you, honestly; "he calls to them that they may be more deaf—he kindles a light that they may be the more blind—he brings his doctrine to them that they may be more ignorant—and applies the remedy to them that they may not be healed."*

Arm. And after all this you say, that you do not make God the author of sin?

Cal. No, certainly; "God cannot be termed the author of sin, though he is the cause of those actions that are sins."†

Arm. How is he the cause of them, then?

Cal. Two ways. First, "by his eternal and unchangeable decree;" and secondly, "by his present irresistible power."

Arm. Am I to understand you to say, that God foreordained the sins of any man?

Cal. Yes; "both the reprobates and the elect were foreordained to sin, as sin, that the glory of God might be declared thereby. The reprobates more especially, who were predestinated to damnation and the causes of damnation, and created to that end that they may live wickedly, and be vessels full of the dregs of sin."‡

Arm. But surely the sins of the elect were not foreordained?

Cal. Yes, but they were; "for we neither can do more good than we do, nor less evil than we do; because God from eternity has precisely decreed that both the good and the evil should be so done."§

Arm. I now again understand you as to God's decreeing sin, but how is his irresistible power concerned in the sins of men?

Cal. In this way "God is the author of that action which is sinful, by his irresistible will."‖

Arm. How do you mean?

Cal. "God procures adultery, cursings, lyings. He supplies wicked men with opportunities of sinning, and inclines their hearts thereto,—he blinds, deceives, and seduces them,—he, by his working on their hearts, bends and stirs them up to do evil;" and thus "thieves, murderers, and other malefactors, are God's instruments, which he uses to execute what he hath decreed in himself."¶

* Calvin's Institutes, Book III. chap. xxiv. sec. 13.

† Peter Mortyr's Commentary on Rom. p. 413.

‡ Zanch. de Nat. Dei, p. 555; and Piscator, p. 47.

§ Piscatoris Responsio, &c. p. 176. ‖ Dr. Twiss, Book III. p. 21.

¶ Piscatoris Res. &c.; Peter Mortyr's Com. on Rom. pp. 36, 413; Cal. Inst. Book. I. chap. xvii. sec. 5.

Arm. You then very plainly charge God himself with sin?

Cal. O no; "God necessitates them only to the act of sin, not to the deformity of sin." Besides, "when God makes angels or men to sin, he does not sin himself, because he does not break any law —for God is under no law—and therefore cannot sin."*

Arm. How does God make angels or men to sin?

Cal. "The devil and wicked men are so held in on every side with the hand of God, that they cannot conceive, or contrive, or execute any mischief any further than God himself doth not permit only, but command; nor are they only held in fetters, but compelled also as with a bridle to perform obedience to those commands."†

We need go no further into the arcana of real Calvinism, nor bring out any more of its jems. Those who are disposed to see more of the same kind of doctrine may be gratified by consulting the authors from whom the above quotations are made. In the above extracts we have enough to inform us of what it really is; and though the authors quoted are some ancient, and some modern, they all speak on this subject one and the same language, though they differ wide as the poles on other points. They all tell us most plainly, that God Almighty has determined every thing that comes to pass in time in the counsels of eternity, and that nothing whatever, in the whole compass of moral or intellectual being, comes to pass in any other way, or on any other principle, than the will and foreordination of God. In this doctrine we find, indeed, that there is a vast system of intellectual beings, governed by two distinct and very opposite principles,—one is sin, the other is holiness; and that the one is as necessary as the other for the purposes of a right government and infallible issue; and that both of these principles have emanated, and do constantly flow from one and the same source, and that source is God. Devils and wicked men are as obedient in the sphere in which God has placed them as angels and saints are in theirs. It is now, therefore, perfectly useless to contend and argue on the vast moral difference that exists between sin and holiness, saints and sinners, since not one of these could have the slightest option in the selection of their respective spheres of existence and action; nor has one of them the least fraction of power to alter their state and condition, or to deviate from the

* Dr. Twiss' Vindication, part iii. p. 22; Zuinglius' Sermon on Providence, chap. 5, 6.

† Cal. Inst. Book I. chap. 17. sec. 11.

practice to which they were individually foreordained! The whole universe of moral and intellectual beings are reduced to mere puppets, acted upon by an external and superior power which none of them can resist; and that power is the will and eternal decree of God. This scheme, as deduced from the various authors quoted above, plainly warrants the following inference, which, for the sake of brevity and precision, we shall form into a syllogism, and it will be found to be the following:—

That it is the appointment and will of God that all creatures should submit to his government, and obey the decisions of his will. All creatures, of whatever genus, grade, distinction, place, and time, do submit to his government, and obey the decisions of his will.

Ergo, there is not one sinner in the whole universe!! This is the awful but legitimate conclusion to which every consistent Calvinist is obliged to come. But, alas, there are too many glaring facts occurring every day that show the fallacy of the conclusion. Sin is in the world—sinners are every day *disobeying* the commandments of God, and wantonly violating his holy law, and thereby criminally crossing his most holy will. Now, just for the sake of exposing another inconsistency of this school, let us hear their definition of sin—and it is the following:—"Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, any law of God, given as a rule to the reasonable creature."*

This embodies a most excellent and sound piece of theology. Sin certainly is "any want of conformity unto," &c., as defined in answer to the question proposed. But our inquiry is this, where, in the face of what has been quoted?—namely, "that the wills of men are so governed by the will of God, that they are carried on straight to the mark which he has foreordained," &c. &c. The purest tyro in logic must at once see that in this there can be no "want of conformity unto," nor "any transgression of, any law of God." All are "carried on *straight to the mark* which he has foreordained,"—all the murderers! adulterers! drunkards! thieves and robbers!! "are carried on straight to the mark," and that without deviating one hair's breadth throughout all their assassinations, beastialities, sottishnesses, and plunder, as shot from the bow of God Almighty's foreordaining hand; and not one of them "deviates one iota from the plans and purposes of God." "Every step of every individual character receives as determined a character from the hand

* Larger Catechism, Quest. 24.

of God as every mile of a planet's orbit, or every gust of wind, or every wave of the sea, or every particle of flying dust, or every rivulet of flowing water." No matter, therefore, on this hypothesis, whether it was the sovereign will of God that many, yea, the greatest part of intellectual beings, were discharged through all the labyrinths of wickedness straight on to hell! or through all the elysiums of piety direct to heaven. This can make no difference to the respective subjects according to this scheme, for it is evident that they had neither part nor lot in the matter as to choosing their course—fixing the period of starting—regulating their speed—or arriving at their destinations, &c.; for, according to genuine Calvinism, throughout the whole process, they are treated and acted upon as mere inert matter—they are made purely passive! All men are propelled to the commission of every action throughout their lives, good and bad, wise and foolish, innocent and criminal, by an irresistible agency, and that agency is God! This is really the genuine language of Calvinism, and the only logical deduction that can be made therefrom. Therefore, according to this scheme, the atonement of Christ is made perfectly unnecessary and useless—the preaching of the gospel—the operations of the Holy Spirit—and attention to all the means of grace equally unnecessary; for the numbers on both sides, that is, the elect and reprobates, are so certain, "fixed, and definite, that they can neither be *increased* nor *diminished*." Besides all this, if this doctrine be true, God must needs look down on this earth of ours, and on the regions below, with supreme delight!! Seeing every creature in them both is doing his will as angels do in heaven! What a happy sight it is, according to this theory, for him to see the diligence, assiduity, and care wrought in the mind of all profane persons by his own Almighty and irresistible power, carefully and constantly exemplified. Eager to move on in the defined path, and carried forward "straight to the mark," and that "without one single iota of deviation" throughout the entire course! an ardent rivalry, and ambitious emulation characterises every fiend, and consummate sinner, who shall please him most, and obey him best!!! The Pagan worshippers in Tibet and Hindostan, performing their cruel and execrable rites;—the wheels of Juggurnaut crushing to death its wretched devotees;—the savage hordes of New Zealand feasting on the flesh of their fellow-men, whom they have cruelly butchered, and drinking their blood out of human skulls;—the Indians of America tearing with pincers the flesh of their prisoners, and enjoying a diabolical pleasure in beholding their torments;—the haughty Inquisitors of Spain

insulting their devoted victims in the name of the merciful Saviour, and preparing tortures and stakes for their destruction;—the assassin plunging his dagger into his neighbour's bosom;—the midnight robber entering into the abode of honest industry, strangling its inmates, and carrying away its treasures;—the kidnapper tearing away the poor African from his wife, and children, and native land;—the unfeeling planter and overseer lashing their degraded slaves;—tyrants and persecutors dragging the excellent ones of the earth to prisons, dungeons, and gibbets;—the malevolent and envious man devising schemes for the ruin and destruction of his neighbour;—the mutinous crew, in the midst of the ocean, rising up against their superiors, slashing them with their sabres, and plunging their bodies to the deep;—the gamester ruining a whole family by a throw of the dice;—the sceptic sporting with the most sacred truths;—the atheist attempting to defy the Omnipotent;—the prostitute wallowing in the mire of uncleanliness;—the drunkard blaspheming him in his midnight revels;—numerous tribes of human beings dashing out each other's brains in mutual combat;—hypocritical professors of religion harbouring malice and revenge against their brethren;—these, together with thousands of other iniquitous scenes that are daily perpetrated,—yea, and even "devils with devils damned firm concord holding!" must afford the eyes and heart of Omniscience the most exquisite and supreme delight, if Calvinism be true,—for "everything comes to pass according to the foreordination of God,"—and it is certain that he cannot foreordain anything but what is well pleasing in his own sight,—consequently every creature in the universe is constantly doing the will of God. Hence, there can be no disobedience in the whole world—there never was, nor never will be, on this scheme, "any want of conformity unto, or deviation from, the law of God." All is conformity, without the slightest deviation, according to this hypothesis,—why, therefore, should God express himself "as repenting him of making man," &c.?—and why should any sinner be called upon to repent and forsake his way? since every sinner's way is sketched out by the unerring wisdom and foreordination of God—and every man, angel, and devil, walking "straight to the mark," along their appointed path, "without deviating one single iota" from the prescribed course from beginning to end!

CHAP. III.

POINTS OF AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT ON THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION AND REPROBATION.

It is a happy circumstance, in a controversy of any kind, that the parties differing can, in some instances, meet one another on common and friendly ground, throw their weapons aside, and mutually agree.

We, remember, do not differ on a number of theological points on which a Calvinist can dilate with supreme delight. Such, for instance, is the doctrine of the ever-blessed Trinity—the divinity and personality of Son and Spirit—the attributes of God—the fall of man—the *necessity* of an atonement for sin—the equally necessary operation of the Holy Spirit on the human mind, in order to salvation, &c. On these points, there is generally an unanimity of views and oneness of expression; and so there is, moreover, on the doctrine of election, to a certain extent. We all agree that election and reprobation, too, are spoken of in the Bible; and that in some instances an unconditional election is mentioned. Such is the election of Cyrus, king of Persia, to build the temple in Jerusalem—the election of the Jews to be an external or visible church —the election of Paul to preach the gospel to the Gentiles; and of the Gentiles to be a visible church, bearing the name of Christ, &c. &c. In these particulars we agree; but we cannot agree with our Calvinistic brethren in saying, that "the Bible teaches the doctrine of eternal, personal, and unconditional election of some men to life everlasting," together with its inseparable concomitant of "eternal, personal, and unconditional reprobation of all the rest of mankind to inevitable damnation." Here we decidedly differ. But that there are the "elect, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ," we as firmly believe, and as strenuously maintain, in its true scriptural meaning, as our opponents do; and upon this very passage let us read the *note* of the venerable John Wesley, who writes thus upon it:—

According to the foreknowledge of God.—"Speaking after the manner of men, strictly speaking, there is no foreknowledge no more than afterknowledge, with God; but all things are known to him as present, from eternity to eternity. This is, therefore, no

other than an instance of the divine condescension to our low capacities.—*Elect.* By the free love and Almighty power of God, taken out of, separated from, the world. Election, in the Scriptural sense, is God's doing anything that our merit or power have no part in. The true predestination or foreappointment of God is,—1st, He that believeth shall be saved from the guilt and power of sin; 2d, He that endureth to the end shall be saved eternally; 3d, They who receive the precious gift of faith, thereby become the sons of God; and, being sons, they shall receive the spirit of holiness, to walk as Christ also walked. Throughout every part of this appointment of God, promise and duty go hand in hand. All is free gift; and yet such is the gift, that the final issue depends on our future obedience to the heavenly call. But other predestination than this, either to life or death eternal, the Scripture knows not of. Moreover it is,—1st, cruel respect of persons—an unjust regard of one, and an unjust disregard of another: it is mere creature partiality, and not infinite justice; 2d, It is not plain Scripture doctrine, if true, but rather inconsistent with the express written word, that speaks of God's universal offers of grace, his invitations, promises, threatenings, being all *general;* 3d, We are bid to choose life, and reprimanded for not doing it; 4th, It is inconsistent with a state of probation in those that must be saved or must be lost; 5th, It is of fatal consequence; all men being ready, on very slight grounds, to fancy themselves of the elect number. But the doctrine of predestination is entirely changed from what it formerly was: now it implies neither faith, peace, nor purity; it is something that will do without them all; faith is no longer, according to the modern predestinarian scheme, a divine 'evidence of things not seen,' wrought in the soul by the immediate power of the Holy Ghost—not an evidence at all, but a mere notion; neither is faith made any longer a means of holiness, but something that will do without it—Christ is no more a Saviour from sin, but a defence, a countenancer of it—he is no more a fountain of spiritual life in the soul of believers, but leaves his elect inwardly dry, and outwardly unfruitful; and is made little more than a refuge from the image of the heavenly, even from righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.—*Through sanctification of the Spirit.* Through the renewing and purifying influences of his Spirit on their souls.—*Unto obedience.* To engage and enable them to yield themselves up to all holy obedience, the foundation of all which is, *the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ*—the atoning blood of Christ, which was typified by the sprinkling of the blood

of sacrifices under the law, in allusion to which, it is called *the blood of sprinkling.*"*

By the above remarks it is evident that there is an agreement between us and our Calvinistic brethren on some points, and to a certain extent, even on the doctrine of election, but in other particulars our difference is great.

CHAP. IV.

AN EXAMINATION OF THOSE SCRIPTURES WHICH ARE GENERALLY INSISTED UPON BY THE CALVINISTS, TO PROVE AND ESTABLISH THE DOCTRINE OF ETERNAL, PERSONAL, AND UNCONDITIONAL ELECTION AND REPROBATION.

When an appeal is made to the Sacred Volume in vindication, illustration, or proof of any point of doctrine, we are always glad, because these alone are the infallible standards of the Christian faith. The Scriptures, like their eternal Author, are without any variableness or shadow of turning; immutability is stamped upon all their truths; they always speak the same language, in every place, and at all times. Great and learned men that are not inspired, may, and often do err, but the Holy Ghost, by whom all Scripture is given, cannot. Therefore, if we find that the doctrine which we are now opposing, will be found taught in these Scriptures, we promise, on our own part, at once to give up the point—yield to that high and infallible authority, and at once believe their declarations on the doctrine. But, on the other hand, if we find that it is not the doctrine of the Bible—that the Holy Ghost never inspired "holy men of old with it"—we must be allowed to dissent from all the great and good men in the category of Calvinism, notwithstanding their number, intelligence, erudition, and piety, and act in this respect as the disciples of our Lord did on one occasion—"obey God, rather than men." Let us therefore "to the law and to the testimony" on this great and disputed point, and if it will be found, on an impartial examination, and that by taking whole chapters and entire epistles in their true and proper connection under our survey, that the language of Scripture thus taken, and thus exhibited, is at variance with our respectable opponents on the point in debate,

* Wesley on 1 Pet. i. 2.

we must, with great deference to them as a body, say, in the language of inspiration touching this point, "if they speak not according to this word," that is, the word of the law and testimony, "it is because there is no light in them," and that they "do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God." The principal passages of holy writ generally adopted by our respected opponents, to substantiate their views of eternal election and reprobation, are the 17th chapter of St. John's Gospel; the 8th, 9th, and 10th chapters of the Epistle to the Romans; together with the first three chapters of the Epistle to the Ephesians. Here they fancy themselves strong, safe, and invulnerable; though we must, in justice and honesty, say, that they conceive this doctrine to be a vein that runs through the whole Bible, and connecting itself with all its statements; still, the passages referred to above, are regarded as their stronghold; the great citadel is there—and we conceive it to be a fact, in the estimation of our Calvinistic brethren, that if the doctrine is not really to be found in these, that it is not in any part of the Bible; and that, if it cannot be defended on the arena of these passages combined, it cannot be defended on any other ground. Here it must, therefore, either live and triumph, or yield to rational truth and die! In order to observe a systematical arrangement in the examination of these passages, we will take them just in the order in which they stand:—let us, therefore, begin with the 17th chapter of St. John's Gospel. It may, however, be necessary to inform you of the reason generally assigned by our Calvinistic brethren for their maintaining that the doctrine of personal election, &c., is to be found in this chapter, and it is this—in the 9th verse the Saviour says, "*I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for them which thou givest me; for they are thine.*" From this they infer, that, because Christ here confines his prayer exclusively to the disciples in particular terms, that he necessarily did not die for all men; and that, therefore, it is plain none else are elected, but those for whom he here prays; because, as they say, "he only prays at any time for the redeemed, and the redeemed only are the elect." We at once grant that there is a speciality in this part of the prayer, and that he only prays here for his disciples. Will our respected brethren, therefore, have it, that none were ever elected save the party here prayed for? for it is perfectly clear, that in this part of the prayer all are left out except the disciples that were then with him in the world; if so, they, and they only, make up the "definite number so fixed, that it can neither be increased nor diminished." On this hypothesis, we now seriously ask,

what is to become—not of all the rest of the human family—but what is to become of our Calvinistic brethren themselves? for it is clear, to a demonstration, that they are not included in this part of the prayer!—and on which part, too, so much stress is generally laid by them; but it is evident that not one of them, no, not one, is prayed for here; so if we reason from the above premises, as they do, the conclusion is, that all the human family are reprobates except the disciples here prayed for. In this case all the Calvinists must yield the point of their own eternal election, or claim their salvation in some other way! This is a most serious dilemma, on the horns of which every Calvinist in the world is seen to hang. On this supposition, that is, that none are elect but those here prayed for, why concern themselves about who may, or may not, be the elect; seeing that their all-absorbing proposition, from which all their premises and conclusions are drawn and fixed, is, the fact of Christ not praying here for the "world," and "for all men," but "exclusively for those that were given him," then "out of the world;" that is, plainly, for those disciples that were then attached to him, and became his faithful followers. We maintain as strenuously, and much more consistently than any thorough Calvinist can do, that Christ does not certainly pray, in this part of his prayer, "for the world;" no, nor yet for all the church either, but exclusively for his disciples that were then with him. But we conceive it to be bad logic, indeed, to infer from this that he did not *die for all men*, and that only a certain number has been elected to life eternal, and all the rest doomed to unavoidable damnation!! To make the case more clear and striking, and the fallacy of this sort of reasoning more glaring, take this illustration:—Suppose a natural father, blessed by the God of providence with twelve children, four of whom are set apart, by his own will and discretion, to the performance of some great, arduous, and important undertaking; the father feels deeply their critical position; he prays to the God of heaven to bless them, support, sustain, and succeed their undertaking; the greatness of the work, the peril connected with its execution, together with a sense of the close and endearing relationship that now exists between them and himself; and connected with all this is the fact, that he himself is under the necessity of withdrawing from the scene of action. All these things induce him to mention the select four, pray for them exclusively, and pass by, at this time, the other eight. What would be thought in this case of the following conclusion, that the other eight were either not his offspring, or that he intended one day to put ropes about their necks

and hang them all to death, and then turn them every one into a fire which he had kindled for that purpose! And all this for no previous crime which the eight had committed against him, but because he had determined thus to dispose of his children before any one of them were born, nor had either done good or evil; all is done to gratify his passion for blood—or, in true Calvinistic phrase, "for the praise of his glorious justice." We ask again, what would be thought of the horrid, monstrous, sickening, and disgusting conclusion? drawn merely from the fact, that the father, on one particular occasion, prayed exclusively for the four just mentioned, and not for the whole twelve. No doubt such a conclusion would be scouted out of every rational and intelligent circle, and those who drew it would be thought either insincere or perfectly mad! Our revered brethren may, perhaps, object to this case of illustration as not being a fair one, and that it does not rightly represent their views on the subject. Then we must inquire, what is a fair representation, if this is not? for it is sufficiently plain that they have not a shadow of reason for their conclusion in the 17th chapter of St. John's Gospel. The only data upon which they proceed is the fact already stated, and that is Christ praying for his disciples; and from this they arrive at the conclusion, that Christ did not die but for the select few; they, and they only, are the elect; all the rest of mankind are passed by and doomed to inevitable wo!

For a proper settling of this question, as far as it can be settled from this chapter, let us now take a brief survey of the whole of it, and, no doubt, this is the only way that should be taken with all controversial points; and not build a creed on an abstract passage, or on the bare sound of a word, but upon whole passages in their proper and legitimate connection, or upon entire epistles, &c., taken in the same way; for upon detached and separate passages taken from their true connection almost any absurdity may be formed. The chapter, under consideration at present, contains our Redeemer's intercessory prayer, which is supposed to be modelled after the style and manner of the High Priest's annual intercessory prayer, in which it it said that he prayed first for himself, or rather made intercession first for himself; next for his colleagues—then for the Jewish Church that was then extant—and, lastly, for the whole Jewish nation; and not excluding the Gentile nations. There is evidently in this prayer of our Lord, delivered in the solemn midnight hour, just before his agony and death, a similar arrangement; there is, obviously, an *order* in its construction, which will be the more readily perceived by a short classification of its several parts.

Then, from verse the 1st to the 5th Christ prays for himself: his words are, "Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee. As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him; and this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. I have glorified thee on earth; I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. And now, O Father, glorify thou me, with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." This part embodies the blessed Redeemer's supplication to his Father in behalf of *himself*, and for the blessings therein mentioned, which are so plainly and so distinctly stated, so as to require no remark from us to let you into the meaning of them. The second part of it, from verse the 6th to the 19th, contains his intercession *for his Apostles:* and his words here are, which we shall insert, with the learned Dr. Whitby's paraphrase, "I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world; thine they were, (*by faith in thee before,*) and thou gavest them me, (*by causing them to believe in me,*) and they have kept thy word. Now, they have (*fully*) known that all things, whatsoever thou hast given (*i. e. authorised*) me, (*to do or say*) are of thee, (*i. e. were indeed thy words and works;*) for I have given (*i. e. declared*) to them the words which thou gavest (*in commission to*) me (*to speak,*) and they have received them (*as thine*), and have known surely that I came out from thee. And they have believed that thou didst send me. I pray for them, I pray not (*in this address*) for the world, but for them which thou hast (*already*) given me (*out of it,*) for they are thine, (*having thee for their Father;*) and all mine are thine (*thy children*), and thine are mine, (*having me for their teacher and guide,*) and I am glorified in them, (*by the miracles done by them in my name, and by the converts they make to the Christian faith.*) And now I am no more in the world, but these (*my apostles*) are (*to continue*) in the world, and I (*am to*) come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine own name (*or power*) those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one as we are, (*by the participation of thy Spirit.*) While I was with them in the world, I have kept them in thy name, (*and by the power imparted to me;*) those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost (*hath perished or fallen off from me*) but the son of perdition, (*and this it was thy pleasure to permit.*) that the Scriptures might be fulfilled. And now come I to thee, and these things I speak (*in their audience while I am*) in the world, that they might have my joy (*the joy which I*

have promised them, chap. xv. 11) fulfilled in themselves (*by the presence of the Spirit, whose fruits are joy and peace*). I have given (*i. e. taught*) them thy word, and the world hath hated them because they are not of the world—(see chap. xv. 18, 19). I pray thee not that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou wouldst keep them from the evil (*of the world*). (*And thus I pray because*) they are not of the world, (*and will certainly be hated by it,*) even as (*I have been, because*) I am not of the world. Sanctify them through (*grace in, or for the propagation*) thy truth, (*by sending the Holy Ghost upon them ;*) thy word (*they are to preach to the world,*) is (*the truth.*) As thou hast sent me into the world, (*to deliver thy mind to it,*) even so have I sent them into the world (*on the same errand*). (See the Note on chap. xx. 21.) which is as follows:—'As my Father hath sent me so send I you'—not only to preach in my name, as I did in his, but as he sending me, baptised me with the Holy Ghost, and so anointed me to my office. Luke iv. 18. John x. 36. So will I send you; baptising you also with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. Luke xxiv. 49. And so anoint you also for your office. 2 Cor. i. 21, 22. And in testimony of this, I say to you now *receive the Holy Ghost*; verse 27, and will soon after my ascension send him more plentifully down upon you." "And for their sakes I sanctify (*i. e. I offer up*) myself (*a piacular victim*) that they also (*being justified through faith in me*) might be sanctified through (*grace in or for*) the truth." (See verse 17.) Thus ends the second part of this inimitable prayer, and that without one word about Calvinistic election and reprobation. The Apostles, as you now doubtless plainly see, are specially included.

Let us now proceed to the third part of it. This is contained in verses 20, 21, 22, and 23. This part is most comprehensive. When he has prayed for himself, and then for his Apostles, a new class of subjects are designed and included; and no less a class is this "than all men," denominated by way of contradistinction from actual believers. "The World," therefore, is here prayed for. For thus we read, "neither pray I for these alone, (*that is for my Apostles, as I have hitherto done,*) but for them also which *shall* believe on me through their word." That is, doubtless, for all that should be brought to God through their preaching, that they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, (*by the participation of that Spirit which is in me.*) That the World—(that is the world of ungodly men, including, beyond all contradiction, every living man)—"That the world (*by*

the powerful operation of this Spirit in them,) may (*be induced to*) believe that you hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me (*i. e. the power of doing miracles by the Spirit of God,*) I have given them that they may be one, as we are one. (Verse 21.) I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one, (*Spirit working in them as it did in me,*) and that (*so*) the WORLD may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them (*i. e. the world,*) as thou hast loved me." Thus ends, you perceive, the third part of this admirable prayer without the slightest insinuation of the doctrine of eternal and unconditional election and reprobation. But quite the reverse. "The world" is here said to have been "loved by the Father," and, therefore, its salvation and its union with the Church are prayed for by Christ. Irrefragable proofs these, of the fallacy and absurdity of the doctrine which we are now opposing. The fourth and the last part of the prayer is included in verse 24, and to the end of the chapter; which we shall not now take up your time by quoting. We refer you to it merely. Read it at your leisure, and you will find that it contains a more specific reference *to the disciples*, that were appointed by Christ to go and encounter the perils of a persecuting world, and that for the benevolent purpose of converting it whole and entire to the knowledge of the truth. Therefore, these messengers had a larger share in the Redeemer's valedictory prayer than was even allotted for himself. The whole prayer, however, may be summed up thus:—1st, Receive me into thy own and my glory; 2d, Let my Apostles share therein; 3d, And all other believers; 4th, And let the *world* believe. In this brief analysis you have the substance of one of the sublimest prayers that was ever uttered; and, as Mr. Wesley well observes, that "this chapter contains the easiest words and the deepest sense of any in all the Scriptures; yet is here no incoherent rhapsody, but the whole is closely and exactly connected." And now, after a close investigation of it, we cannot find a single trace of the doctrine of Calvinian election and reprobation. The fact is, it is not to be found in any part of it; but everything the reverse. It is at once, and frankly, admitted that Christ prayed here for the Church that was then formed, and bearing his name. He prays, as you perceive, for its unity, harmony, and extension. But he also prayed "*for the world*" at the same time, that it might, through the Church's instrumentality, "believe in him," and be saved thereby. Where now, in the face of this, can we find any foundation for the frigid and narrow, repulsive, and excluding doctrine of eternal, personal, and unconditional election and reprobation? We

gladly and equally fearlessly answer, not in the 17th chapter of the Gospel according to St. John.

CHAP. V.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

We are now coming to the stronghold of Calvinism—their boasted city of refuge to which they all run for safety when their doctrine is pursued by the language of truth, and if they can only escape for their lives into this, and get as far in, before they are overtaken and slain, as the 8th and 9th chapters, they imagine themselves safe and invulnerable; and seldom do they hesitate to hurl defiance at their presumptuous and daring foe from this place; and never do they apparently imagine, for a moment, that there is the slightest danger of being taken even at this altar. But, pray, what is the fact? Does the Apostle in this epistle teach the doctrine of personal and eternal election and reprobation of some men to life, and of others to eternal wo? Certainly not. Be the doctrine in itself right or wrong, true or false, Scriptural or unscriptural, it is not taught in the epistle to the Romans. What, then, is the doctrine which is taught therein? for it is plain that this epistle is truly doctrinal in its character. We answer, that the great and cardinal point of doctrine taught in this epistle is, *justification by faith in Jesus Christ.* This is the fundamental subject which is so largely and so eloquently expatiated upon in this sublime epistle; as will be clear from a short survey of all its parts, taken in their true and proper connection. Before, however, we enter fully into an examination of this sublime production of inspiration, it will not be amiss just to glance at the state of the parties to whom it was primarily addressed. These, therefore, were Jews and Gentiles collected together, through the agency of the gospel, into one visible church, professing then to be a Christian community, and that in one of the most rich, splendid, and intelligent cities in the world, as Rome evidently was in the days of the Apostle Paul. The habits and religious views of the parties thus congregated together in one external church were very different from each other's. The Jewish part had been trained within the pale of the Jewish Church—so pregnant with high, and even splendid offerings, &c.; all this had induced a habit of thinking, in their minds, that was exceedingly prejudicial to the interests of the Gen-

tiles. I need not tell you, that a Jew could hardly be persuaded to believe in the salvation of a Gentile, on any terms whatever. Instance Peter, as recorded in the 10th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and from verse 9 to 43, but more particularly in the 28th verse. In this we have a full and clear development of the feeling that existed in the mind, not only of Peter, but of every Jew, towards the Gentile population. This will, however, form a key to the figures employed by our Apostle in the 8th and 9th chapters of this epistle, illustrative of the *sovereignty of God*. They are advanced to convince the Jew that God possessed the same power over the Gentiles under the gospel dispensation, that he possessed and exercised over them when they were, as a nation and people elected of God, in preference to others, to be his visible church. The Gentile, on the other hand, being now at the dissolution of the Jewish economy, by the coming of Christ, and by an exhibition of a more noble sacrifice, even himself on the cross for the sins of all mankind, were elevated to the same rank of moral and religious privileges as the Jews; they not unfrequently manifested a disposition to retaliate in a language and conduct most unbefitting their recent and most transcendent elevation. Hence the solemn warnings, and faithful admonitions, which are specially tendered to them, and only applicable to themselves, in the 11th chapter of this epistle, from verse the 17th to 25th. Here was, therefore, one community, formed out of two nations, differing very widely in their views and feelings of divine truths. And it is not certainly difficult to conceive that these discordant elements, when thus brought into such a close connection, occasionally varied. Their respective views differed very widely on the *mode* of obtaining justification before God. The Jew would have it by the presentation of an animal offering as heretofore, or, as the Apostle terms it, "by the law." See chap. ii. 25th verse. The Gentile, on the other hand, expected to realise it by the exercise of simple faith on the Son of God. The main and only design of this epistle, therefore, is to settle the question at issue, put it on its right and permanent basis, and thus for ever allay the too highly excited and irritable feelings that were too visible and too prevalent in the Church of Rome at this time. Hence the Apostle alternately addresses the Jews and the Gentiles. The former required to be lowered from their high and towering, haughty and censorious views. They are, therefore, reminded of the sovereign power of God to fix upon what terms best agreeing with his own wisdom and goodness to bestow his blessings to man. The Gentile part of this Church stood in

need of more light and information touching this cardinal point. When they are specially addressed, arguments of a different nature are employed, such as the boundless and free mercy of God—the universality of his grace flowing through the atonement of Christ's death to all mankind. Thus the middle wall of partition, which had so long divided this community, was once more broken down, and both parties are made again one in Christ. The subject in all its fulness was brought before them; and the respective prejudices of the parties merged into one great and safe channel, and that channel is the free and universal love of God to man, which was so illustriously exhibited in the abolition of all the Jewish sacrifices, and the exhibition of the sacrifice of his only begotten Son delivered for us all; through faith in which alone the Apostle plainly demonstrates to both parties, and to all the world, justification is to be sought for and obtained. This is, evidently, the design of this magnificent and extraordinary epistle, which was primarily addressed to the Church of Rome in its infant state, and designed to serve the purposes of redeeming love and actual salvation throughout the world to the end of time. All this will appear more fully as we proceed in our survey of the several chapters. Let us, therefore, look at the contents of the 1st chapter. Here, therefore, 1st, we find the Apostle asserting his right to his Apostleship, and laying down, as his first and fundamental proposition, the real divinity and eternal Sonship of Jesus Christ, as you may see by reading verses 1 to 7. And this is, doubtless, intended for the purpose of showing the parties addressed his *right* to the position which he now assumes among them, and towards them; that is, to teach them the way of salvation as exhibited in the gospel economy, together with the only foundation upon which is rested the hope of sinners for justification before God; and this, you perceive, to be the real divinity and eternal Sonship of Christ Jesus, the author of human redemption; all of which are based by the Apostle on the *resurrection of Christ from the dead.* Next comes the suitability of the means employed to induce and prepare sinners for a reception of the blessing, which is to be more fully handled in the body of this epistle: the means alluded to is the gospel of Jesus Christ, which, as the Apostle terms it, "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; first to the Jew and then to the Greek," or Gentile—see verses 13 to 17.

The latter part of the chapter contains one of the most moving and awful description that ever was penned of the desperate state of guilt and depravity in which the Gentile nation was involved,

and that not the common and illiterate people merely, but likewise those that exhibited high claims to learning, philosophy, and moral science. The Apostle shows that their conduct was even *beastly*, and consequently extremely revolting. Take up your Bibles at your first convenience, and read from verse 18 to the end of the first chapter.

2. To prevent a wrong conclusion, which the Jews in favour of themselves might deduce from these premises, the servant of Christ proceeds in his delineation of human defection so as to assimilate their moral condition to that of their heathen neighbours around, stain their pride, and convince them of their need of a better righteousness than their own. This is the substance of the 2d chapter and a part of the 3d, from verse 1 to verse 23. Having thus placed both Gentiles and Jews in their true moral attitude and position, the Apostle, in glowing terms, brings forward and developes the gospel scheme of *justification by faith in Christ*, as the author of our redemption—see chap. iii. ver. 24—31 ; and thus ends the first three chapters of this excellent epistle, and that without a single syllable about the doctrine of personal election and reprobation, but everything decidedly against it. The 4th chapter is taken up with a more minute description of the character and properties of the main point, that is, of justification. Here it is defined and illustrated ; it consists of "the forgiveness of sins," &c., and *faith* in Christ is shown to be the only means of obtaining it. As a proof of this, Abraham, the father of the faithful, is brought forward and specially placed before the Jews as an instance of this truth ; that is, that God then, as well as now, justified by faith, and not by the works of the law. Read the whole chapter, and you will see that this is its sum and substance. In the 5th chapter the main question is again resumed, and the same grand theme is prosecuted, wherein the ruin and recovery of the whole human race are traced to their respective and identical sources ; that is, the first man, Adam, is rightly placed at the head of our calamity ; the second Adam, or the man Christ Jesus, is placed at the very fountain-head of our recovery. These sources are again contrasted, and by a most striking antethesis the Apostle shows how the grace of the second Adam has triumphed over the guilt and misery created by the first. Read also this chapter carefully, and you will find that this is the argument contained in it. The 6th chapter of this epistle contains a vivid and lucid description of the duty and privileges of persons that are really in a state of justification before God. They are shown how they are required to live a life of faith and holiness ; and these duties

to be thus discharged are founded on the fact of the persons being made free from condemnation by the grace of God, manifested towards them through faith in Christ, &c. &c. The 7th chapter is employed in describing the effects and workings of the mind of a person under conviction of sin, which is induced, by the Spirit of God applying the power of the law to the conscience. This effect is shown to be fatal to the pride and vanity of the carnal man, who becomes overwhelmed with grief, sorrow, and distress on account of past transgressions, and oft-repeated violation of the law of God—which extorts from him the self-condemning exclamation, "O wretched man that I am!" &c. Some men, however, are of opinion that the Apostle is here speaking of the remains of the carnal mind in his own soul; but this must be a great mistake, for he himself was effectually redeemed from the power of guilt and sin, years before this epistle was written. He is obviously describing the influence of the law on an awakened conscience, and most eloquent and luminous is the description. The beginning of the 8th chapter contains the language of triumphant declaration and joy of a sinner justified by faith in Jesus Christ. He is seen to have now a positive communication of the fact made to his own soul, that he is really and truly converted to God. Read from verse 1 to 17, and you will be sufficiently convinced of the truth of our present remarks. You see plainly here that justification has its evidences. The person who is justified *knows* it, and is made to rejoice in the fact. It is not, therefore, a blessing which the recipients thereof know nothing of while here on earth; on the contrary, the person justified

"Has the witness in himself,
And consciously believes;"

because, when it is imparted, it is accompanied with its blessed concomitants, regeneration, adoption into God's favour and family, together with "peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." "The Spirit itself," says the Apostle, "beareth witness with our spirits that we are the children of God," &c. From the beginning of the epistle, therefore, we have had nothing even bordering on the chilling doctrine of Calvinistic election and reprobation. Methinks, however, that I hear some one say, "true, we have none of it in the former part of this epistle, but wait till we go a little farther on." Very well. Let us go farther on, then, even to the end; and in our travel through we promise to examine the remaining parts of this, the 9th and the 10th

chapters, more minutely than we have done the former ones; because the doctrine of eternal and unconditional election and reprobation is *supposed* to lie in our way. Let us, then, give it a fair and critical examination. And we again renew our already pledged promise of yielding at once and cheerfully to the authority and decisions of eternal truth. If we find it in any, or in all, of the remaining parts of this sublime letter, we shall at once and for ever embrace it.

CHAP VI.

SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

In verses 28 to 30 of this 8th chapter the doctrine of eternal election, &c., is roundly affirmed to be taught. The words, however, read thus, which we shall now give; and, for the sake of precision and perspicuity, we shall insert with Dr. Whitby's Paraphrase; then we shall endeavour to demonstrate to you their true apostolical and inspired meaning. Let us, therefore, read from the 27th verse. "And he that searcheth the hearts (*of the saints*) knoweth what is the mind, (*or the desire,*) of the Spirit, for he maketh intercession for the saints, according to the will (*or purpose*) of God (*to give them* THIS *redemption of the body*). And though we know not (*in our distresses*) what to pray for, (*in particular, or when we shall obtain this redemption of the body, yet*) we know, that all things shall work together for good (*for securing this happiness*) to them that love God. To them that are called (*to the adoption of sons*) according to his purpose (*of bringing many sons to glory by him.* Heb. ii. 10. *He having predestinated us to the adoption of sons, through Jesus Christ, according to the good pleasure of his will.* Eph. i. 5. *According to his purpose in Christ Jesus.* 2. Tim. i. 19. *Of calling the Gentiles, declared to Abraham.* Gen. xviii. 18; Eph. iii. 1—11.) For (*the Gentiles*) whom he did (*thus*) foreknow (*as he did the Jews, with the same intention of kindness,*) he also did predestinate (*or appoint*) to be conformed to the image of his Son (*by having their vile bodies changed into the likeness of his own glorious body.* Phil. iii. 21.) That he might be the first-born (*or chief*) among many brethren (*who are to be co-heirs and glorified together with him.* Ver. 17.) And (*the method he used to bring whom he had designed to be thus conformed to the image of his Son*

was this, viz.:) whom he thus predestinated, (*to be his people,*) them he also called, (*first to the profession of the Christian faith,*) and whom he called, (*upon their cordial embracing of that faith,*) them he also justified, (*and so freed from condemnation to death,*) and whom he justified, them he also glorified.—*See Whitby in loc.* You have now the words read and partly explained to you, but is the doctrine of eternal, personal, and unconditional election and reprobation to be found in the passage? Our respected brethren answer in the affirmative. Let us, therefore, address ourselves to the words; if taken *literally*, it will be seen that every sentence is spoken in the *past tense*, "whom he predestinated—he called—he justified—he glorified;" that is to say, the persons spoken of were then actually glorified; or, in other words, taken into heaven. The conclusion, therefore, necessarily is, that all the elect are gone to heaven, and that before Paul penned these words. Every one of them, according to this interpretation, had been "called—had been justified—yea, had been glorified;" that is, my friends, in plain English, they had all been taken up to heaven, and were then, as well as they do now,

"Wearing the crown through Christ their own."

Therefore the work of redemption, in the business of saving sinners, was then, and must have been since then, fairly at an end! All the elect were then "*glorified;*" and consequently nothing was left behind but a set of reprobates that "cannot be saved, do what they will."—*Findlay's Sermon.* This is fairly the conclusion, according to the legitimate interpretation of this passage, by our Calvinistic divines. Therefore, all the work of preaching, sending forth missionaries, building churches, conducting Sabbath schools, striving for the spiritual independence of the Church, &c. &c., are, to all intents and purposes, works of supererogation, and perfectly useless, since there is nothing left to work upon but a set of eternally hated, and constantly hateful reprobates. From this conclusion, none will sooner recede, we are quite sure, than our Calvinistic brethren themselves. What, therefore, is the meaning of this passage? and what are the sentiments therein contained? In reply to these important queries, let us observe, that there is in it obviously an ascription of deliberation and planning; and all this is applied to God in reference to the economy of human redemption. The design, however, of the Apostle seems to be, to give to the Gentile population some idea of the *order* observed in the redeeming plan; and this is done in an accommodating style of language, which is well suited to the principle and power of analogical reason-

ing in the mind of man. When a great work is contemplated by man, previous thinking, planning, and arranging, are implied. Hence it is very easy to conceive the same conduct on the part of the Most High, and attribute to God what we discover to be in ourselves. This principle is lucidly explained by an eminent divine of the eighteenth century in the following manner:—"When a man has a work of time and importance before him he pauses, consults, and contrives; and when he has laid a plan, resolves or decrees to proceed accordingly. Having observed this in ourselves, we are ready to apply it to God also; and he, in condescension to us, has applied it to himself. The works of providence and redemption are vast and stupendous, and therefore we are apt to conceive of God as deliberating and consulting on them, and then decreeing to act according to 'the counsel of his own will,' as if long before the world was made, he had been concerting measures both as to the making and governing of it, and had then writ down his decrees, which altered not, any more than the laws of the Medes and Persians. Whereas, to take this consulting and decreeing in a *literal* sense, would be the same absurdity as to ascribe a real human body and human passions to the ever-blessed God. This is only a popular representation of his infallible knowledge and unchangeable wisdom; that is, he does all things as nicely as a man can possibly do, after the deepest consultation; and as steadily pursues the most proper method as one can do who has laid a scheme beforehand. But, then, though the effects be such as would argue consultation and consequent decrees in man, yet, what need of a moment's consultation in him who sees all things at one view? Nor had God any more occasion to pause and deliberate, and lay down rules for his own conduct from all eternity, than he has now. What! was there any fear of his mistaking afterwards, if he had not beforehand prepared decrees, to direct him what he was to do? Will any man say he was wiser before the creation than since? or had he then more leisure, that he should take that opportunity to settle his affairs, and make rules for himself, from which he was never to vary? He has, doubtless, the same wisdom, and all other perfections, at this day, which he had from eternity; and is now as capable of making decrees, or rather has no more need of them now than formerly, his understanding being always equally clear and bright, his wisdom equally infallible."—*Wesley in loc.* Here we, therefore, see why such phraseology is used. It is employed purely and exclusively in accommodation to our weak capacities, and much in the same way, and with the same design, as Christ uttered his parables,—

namely, to help the darkness and weakness of our minds to conceive of divine things. It is also worthy of remark, that there is not a word here about non-election or reprobation to eternal misery! The passage contains a correct and clear view of the method employed in the economy of actual redemption, and exclusively applies to those persons that were then "foreknown, predestinated, and called," &c.; or, in other words, to true believers in Christ Jesus. They were first "foreknown" or approved of God, and received into his Church; then were they "predestinated," that is, were determined beforehand to be justified; because evidently they were then believers in Christ, and as such are they spoken of throughout this passage. We remark here again, that the persons "predestinated," or before determined to be glorified with Christ, are the same persons, under the same circumstances and character, as those who are said to have been "foreknown" of God; that is, still, they were true believers. This predestination is not, therefore, of persons to "faith and obedience," as our respected opponents assert, and consequently perpetually err on this point, but of *believing* and *obedient* persons unto eternal glory; and, in this sense, the terms introduced and employed are perfectly intelligible, and consonant with the whole tenor of Scripture. The persons spoken of are next said to have been "called." Here the Apostle brings in, and connects their justification with, the gospel of Christ. By this they had been invited, or, as he terms it, "called;" and they also, on their part, responded to, and obeyed the call. We have here, therefore, *implied* what is not expressed, namely, the genuine repentance and Scriptural faith of the parties under consideration. None can be justified without the existence and proper exercise of these principles; besides, all this must *precede* the act of justification, as the word of God abundantly testifies. "Repent," is its never-varying and unalterable language, "and be converted." "Every one that *believeth*, and is baptised, shall be saved." "And by him all that *believe* are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." This is the uniform language of the Bible on this subject; and we have no reason to conclude, that these individuals, spoken of in the text, formed an exception to this rule, because their repentance and faith are not mentioned. No, the parties before the Apostle's mind, consisting, probably, of both Jews and Gentiles, had really felt, and truly exercised, the same; otherwise they could not have been justified and saved; for, "except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish," and "he that believeth not shall be damned," are the solemn declarations of the Son of

God himself. Next, they are said to be "justified," that is, all their past sins had been pardoned or forgiven, and they accepted of God as righteous persons through faith in Christ. I need not hardly remind you, in this place, that the terms pardon, forgiveness, and justification, are synonymous words. They all, however, are, and are employed to demonstrate one and the same act. Here, again, we have nothing *said* about their adoption, regeneration, and the witness of the Spirit of God, bearing the direct "testimony to their spirits that they were" then "the children of God." All this is unquestionably implied, and is embodied in the epistle before us. Nor have we a word said about their entire holiness; though this must, doubtless, have preceded the last blessing mentioned, namely, their "glorification;" for, "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." From the whole, therefore, we perceive that the Apostle, in this passage, only furnishes the believer with a general outline of the plan and method which God has adopted, and still prosecutes in the work of conversion; and precisely the same order is adhered to in the present day. Whom he "foreknows," that is, whom he approves of; "he predestinates," that is, he still determines to "glorify;" but, in order to this, they are "called," or invited to repentance and faith. When these are embraced and exercised, then are the persons, so exercising these principles, "justified;" that is, their sins are forgiven; and if the said persons, so justified, prove faithful to the end, then are they "glorified," and that with the glory that the Son, their blessed Redeemer, enjoys at the right hand of God. But let us be careful not to infer from this, that the Apostle meant to convey the idea that the same number precisely is glorified, as was "foreknown, predestinated, called, and justified." No, this is unwarrantable; because, in this very epistle, the Apostle proves the contrary; besides, "many are called but few chosen," and that, for this reason, they refuse the call. Prov. i. 24th verse. The whole body of the Jewish nation had been "called," and that earnestly and sincerely again and again; but they were not *all* justified. Our Calvinistic brethren will not assert this. These men, at least a great number of them, had been "called," even by Christ himself in the days of his flesh. And what was the result? Let Christ himself reply. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen *doth gather* her brood under *her* wings, AND YE WOULD NOT." Luke xiv. 34. Many have been "justified" by faith in Christ, yet, in consequence of neglecting the great conservative

duties of watchfulness and prayer, with their concomitant duties, they have, of their own accord, "cast away their confidence," and degenerated into unbelief and sin, and have perished everlastingly, as the following passages sufficiently prove:—See John xv. 6; Gal. v. 4; 1 Tim. i. 19, 20; Heb. vi. 4—6; and 2 Pet. ii. 20—22. So it is a great mistake to suppose that the number "called," and the number "glorified," is exactly the same. In this passage, thus carefully and critically examined, we do not find in it the Calvinistic doctrine of eternal, personal, and unconditional election and reprobation. Nothing of the kind is found here; all we find is, a general view of the method of redeeming love in bringing sinners to glory. The design of the Apostle, in this passage thus explained, was to encourage the faithful Christians to endure to the end, though that end was, in their case, to be realised by much trial and persecution, as the remainder of the chapter sufficiently shows.

CHAP. VII.

SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Let us now proceed to the ninth chapter. Here, however, our Calvinistic brethren tell us, with much assurance, that the doctrine of eternal election and reprobation is really found, and most strongly advocated. Very well, then; let us see. The former part of it contains the strong and ardent assertions, and are the genuine language of a *public mind*, and are similar to those of Moses, when he said, "yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin—and if not, BLOT ME, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written." Similar is the wish expressed by Paul in behalf of his brethren, "for I could wish that myself were *accursed* from Christ for my brethren, and my kinsmen, according to the flesh." These are the ardent and strong assertions of the Apostle's relative to, and indicative of, the warm and affectionate regards that he entertained for his brethren the Jews—and they breathe the language of diffusive, generous, and noble piety—and are not dissimilar to many more of the pious effusions of great and public minds recorded in the Bible; and at once show that the true Christian lives not for himself, but for others. The Apostle, in the beginning of this chapter, addresses himself more particularly, indeed exclusively, to the Jewish part of his audience, as you may perceive by reading from the 1st to the

9th; and nothing of the doctrine in question will be found in these words. We are, however, requested to "wait till we come to the 10th and succeeding verses." Very well; how do we read. Thus: "But when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac; for the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God, according to election, might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth; it was said unto her, the elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." Here, therefore, in plain terms, we have," say our brethren on the other side, "all we contend for." "It is expressly said that Jacob was elected, and Esau reprobated, before they were born, and, therefore, from all eternity." Hold there, friend; it is not said that one was *elected* and the other *reprobated;* there is not a syllable of that in the passage; the words are, "Jacob have I *loved*, but Esau have I *hated*." But, pray, what is the meaning of the terms employed, namely, "*loving* and *hating?*" In reply, we say, that our knowledge of the oriental dialect must be superficial, indeed, not to know that this mode of speaking prevailed there; and that the meaning is simply this, "Jacob have I loved *more*, but Esau have I loved *less*." Take the following example from our blessed Lord's mode of speaking as an illustration. In Luke xiv. 26th verse, we have the following words:—"If any man come to me, and *hate* not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple," &c. Are we, therefore, to infer from this, that, unless we stir up, and assiduously manifest, all the indignant malevolence possible towards our kindred and ourselves, that we cannot be the disciples of the meek and lowly Saviour? We have as much right to infer this from the word *hate*, in this verse, as we have to infer that the God of love entertained and manifested a malevolent and revengeful disposition towards Esau. The meaning, however, of the term under consideration is established by Christ himself in the following words:—"He that loveth father or mother MORE than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter MORE than me is not worthy of me."—Matt. x. 37. Now, you perceive the meaning of the terms introduced and employed; they simply mean loving *more* and loving *less*. In order properly to understand the meaning of the Apostle in this passage, it is necessary we should go back to the history of these two extraordinary personages; and we find it recorded in Gen. chap. xxv. and from the 21st to the 28th verse,—and it reads thus, "and Isaac entreated the Lord for his wife, because she was barren; and the Lord was

entreated of him, and Rebecca his wife conceived; and the children struggled together within her; and she said, if it be so why am I thus? and she went to inquire of the Lord; and the Lord said unto her, *two nations* are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger. And when her days to be delivered were fulfilled, behold, there were twins in her womb. And the first came out red, all over like an hairy garment; and they called his name Esau. And after that came his brother out, and his hand took hold on Esau's heel; and his name was called Jacob: and Isaac was threescore years when she bear them. And the boys grew, and Esau was a cunning hunter, a man of the field; and Jacob was a plain man, dwelling in tents. And *Isaac loved Esau*, because he did eat of his venison; but *Rebecca loved Jacob*." This is the history to which Paul refers in the passage now under consideration; and it is as plain, that "whosoever runneth may read" it, and understand it. Here, in the history, we find that these children were the founders of "two nations," namely, the Israelites and the Edomites, afterwards called, and known by the name of, Judemeans; one the descendants of Jacob, the other the descendants of Esau; and it is clear, to a demonstration, that not a word is said here about the eternal election of one to life, and of the reprobation of the other to endless death! The fact is, there is here nothing said about the salvation of either of them; the passage is simply adduced to demonstrate to the Jews in the Church of Rome, at that time addressed by the Apostle, the power; or, if you will, the SOVEREIGNTY of God in fixing and allocating the habitations of men on earth. According to this, the Almighty gave unto Jacob the younger, or rather to his descendants, the fertile plains of the land of Canaan; and to Esau, or rather to his posterity, the barren country of Judemea; and all this was done according to the sovereign pleasure of the wise disposer of all events. This is clearly the meaning of this phrase, "the elder shall serve the younger," or "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." See Mal. i. 1—5. And it is worthy of notice, that the phrase, "the elder shall serve the younger," was never fulfilled in the days of the persons named; that is, Esau never did in person serve Jacob. Quite the reverse, as their respective histories abundantly prove. In their respective posterities, however, this prophecy was fulfilled. The Edomites, that is, the descendants of Esau, were conquered by the Israelites, and became subject unto them. *See Calmet's Dictionary, Article Judemea.*

For a full view, and a clear understanding, of this passage, carefully weigh, and attentively observe, the following observations:—

1. The very existence of these two individuals is owing to the *prayers* of a fond and pious father, and not to some determinate transactions in the counsels of eternity, which *must* have come to pass inevitably. "Isaac entreated the Lord;" that is, prayed unto the God of heaven for the blessing of issue from his beloved Rebecca. God heard and answered, and that in a God-like manner; he gave more than Isaac asked; she conceived, and brought forth two sons; the one the darling of the father, the other the favourite of the mother.

2. The transactions recorded in the history, and quoted by the Apostle in this passage, refer not to their persons, but to their posterities; and the word *nations* would have been a better translation of the original, in this place, than the word "children." As the word children is not in the text, the word "*nations*" would be more proper; for it is evident that the Apostle does not speak of *children*, but of *nations*, as the following verses, together with the history quoted and referred to, sufficiently prove.—*See, on this subject, the Critical and Learned Commentaries of Drs. Macknight, Doddridge, Clarke, Whitby, Dodd, and Hammond;* and you will be sufficiently convinced that the Apostle does not refer to the *persons* of Jacob and Esau, but to their *posterities;* besides, these words, "the elder shall serve the younger," with those of Malachi, *Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated*, are cited by the Apostle to prove, according to their typical signification, "*that the purpose of God, according to election*," does, and will stand, "*not of works*, but *of him that calleth;*" that is, that the *purpose of God*, which is the ground of that election which he makes among men, unto the honour of being Abraham's seed, might appear to remain unchangeable in him, and to be even the *same* which he had declared unto Abraham. That these words are used in a *national*, and not in a *personal*, sense, is evident from this, that, taken in the latter sense, they are *not true;* for Jacob never did exercise any dominion or power over Esau, nor was (as we have mentioned before) Esau ever subject to him; Jacob, on the contrary, was rather subject to Esau, and was sorely afraid of him; and, first, by his messengers, and afterwards personally, acknowledged his brother to be his *lord*, and himself to be his *servant.*—See Gen. xxxii. 4, and xxxiii. 8—13. And hence it appears that neither Esau nor Jacob, nor even their posterities, are brought here by the Apostle as instances of any *personal* reprobation from eternity; for it is very certain that very many, if not the

far *greatest part, of Jacob's* posterity were wicked, and rejected by God; and it is not less certain that some of *Esau's* posterity were partakers of the faith of their father Abraham. From these premises, the true sense of the words immediately following, "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated," fully appears; that is, that what he had already cited from Moses concerning the two nations, styled, by the names of their respective heads, Jacob and Esau, was but the same with what was spoken many years after by the prophet Malachi. The unthankful Jews had, in Malachi's time, either in words or in heart, or in both, expostulated with God, and demanded of him wherein he had loved them? "I have loved you, saith the Lord; yet ye say, wherein hast thou loved us?"—Mal. i. 2—5. To this the Lord answers, "was not Esau Jacob's brother? yet I loved Jacob and hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness; whereas Edom saith, we are impoverished, but we will return and build the desolate places; thus saith the Lord of Hosts, they shall build, but I will throw down; and they shall call them the border of wickedness, and the people against whom the Lord hath indignation for ever. And your eyes shall see, and ye shall say, the Lord will be magnified from the border of Israel." From the above,

1st, It incontestably appears, that the prophet does not speak at all of the *person* of Jacob and Esau, but of their respective *posterities;* for it was not Esau in person that said, "we are impoverished," neither were his "*mountains*" nor "heritage laid waste." Now, if the *prophet* speaks neither of the *person* of the one nor of the other, but of their *posterity* only, then it is evident that the *Apostle* speaks of them in the *same way;* 2d, If neither the *prophet* nor the *Apostle* speaks of the *persons* of Jacob or Esau, but of their *posterity,* then it is evident that neither the *love of God to Jacob,* nor the *hatred of God to Esau,* were such, according to which the eternal states of men, either in happiness or misery, are to be determined; nor is there here any Scriptural or rational ground for the decree of unconditional personal election and reprobation, which, comparatively, modern times have endeavoured to build on these Scriptures; for, 1st, It is here proved that *Esau* is not mentioned under any *personal* consideration, but only as the *head* of his *posterity;* 2d, The testimony of Scripture amply proves that all *Esau's posterity* were not, even in this sense, reprobated; nor all *Jacob's posterity* elected; 3d, Neither does that *service,* or subjugation to Jacob, which the divine oracle imposed on Esau, import any such *reprobation* as some men contend for; as the

servant may be *elected*, while the *master* himself is in a state of *reprobation;* 4th, Were it even granted that *servitude* did import such a *reprobation*, yet it is certain that Esau, in person, never did *serve* Jacob; 5th, Nor does the *hatred* of God against Esau import any such reprobation of the person of Esau; because it is demonstrable that it related not to Esau *personally*, but to his *posterity;* 6th, The scope of the Apostle's meaning is to show that God, as the sovereign of his own ways, has a right to dispense his blessings as he chooses, and to give salvation to mankind, not in the way of their devising, but in that way that is most suitable to his own infinite wisdom and goodness. Therefore, 1st, He chose the Jewish nation from all others, and revealed himself to them. Thus, *they* were the *elect*, and all the other *nations* of mankind *reprobate;* 2d, When the fulness of the time came he revealed himself also to the *Gentiles*, who gladly received the gospel; and the Jews, rejecting it, were *cast off;* thus the *elect* became *reprobate*, and the *reprobate elect;* 3d, He published to all mankind, that the pardon of sin could, and should, be obtained ONLY *by faith in his Son Jesus*, and not by *obedience to any law;* and the Jews, the descendants of Jacob, who rejected this way of salvation, became precisely like the *Edomites*, the descendants of Esau; "they builded, but God pulled down; their mountains and heritage are *now* laid waste for the dragons of the wilderness;" and "they" properly may now be "called the border of wickedness, a people against whom the Lord hath indignation for ever;" they have rejected the Lord that bought them, and so have brought upon them swift destruction; 4th, That no *personal*, absolute, eternal reprobation of Esau can be intended, we learn from this, that he was most amply *reconciled* to his brother, who had so deeply wronged and offended him by depriving him of his birthright and his blessing; and his having forgiven his brother his trespasses was no mean proof that God had forgiven him, which may be fairly inferred from the declaration of our Lord on the subject of mutual forgiveness.—See Matt. vi. 14. Therefore there can be assigned no competent ground of his damnation, much less of his *personal* reprobation from all eternity; 5th, And were such a *personal* reprobation intended, is it not shocking to suppose, that the God of endless mercy, in whose sight his pious parents had found favour, should inform *them*, even *before their child was born*, that he had *absolutely consigned him, by an irrevocable decree, to eternal damnation?* A message of such horrid import, coming immediately from the mouth of God, to a tender, weak, and delicate woman, whose hour of travail with two children was just at

hand, could not have failed to produce abortion, and destroy life; but the parents perfectly understood their God, and saw no decree of reprobation in his *message;* "two manner of nations are in thy womb—and the elder shall serve the younger;" 6th, There is no *reason*, worthy the most wise and gracious God, why he should make known to the world such a thing concerning *Esau*, who was yet unborn, that he had reprobated him from all eternity. Such a revelation could be of no spiritual advantage, or edification, to mankind, but rather of a malignant influence, as directly occasioning men to judge hardly of their Maker, and to conceive of him as no faithful Creator; as having no care, no love, no bowels of compassion towards the workmanship of his own hands.—See Dr. A. Clarke on Gen. xxvii. To the above remarks, we shall now add a few more from an eminent old divine, whose incomparable works are too little known, especially in this country. On the subject of Esau's eternal election and reprobation, old John Goodwin writes as follows:—

"Reasons against the reprobation of Esau from eternity."—"Because, 1st, As hath been oft signified and proved from the express words of Scripture, Esau is not here mentioned under any personal consideration, but only as the head and significator of his posterity; 2d, It is the confession of those that are most opposite in the doctrine of reprobation, and may otherwise be evinced from the Scriptures, that all Esau's posterity were not reprobated, in such a sense, as neither were all Jacob's posterity elected; 3d, Neither doth that service or subjection unto Jacob, which the divine oracle imposeth upon Esau, anyways import such a reprobation; inasmuch as the servant may be, and oftentimes is, elected; yea, and this sometimes when the master is in an estate of reprobation—(See 1. Pet. ii. 18; Phil. iv. 22, &c.); 4th, Were it granted that servitude did signify or import such a reprobation as is contended for, yet, certain it is, and hath been proved from the Scriptures, that Esau, in person, never served Jacob; 5th, Neither doth that hatred of God against Esau, mentioned by Malachi, import any such reprobation of the person of Esau; (1st,) Because it related not unto Esau personally considered, as appears from what hath been already said, and may appear yet farther from that description which the prophet himself gives of it, in the fruits or effects thereof; as, namely, the 'laying of his mountains waste;' the 'throwing down when he should build,' &c.; in which kind of fruit or effect it never expressed itself unto or against the person of Esau; (2d,) These very effects of it are not the proper effects of such an hatred in

God, which argueth either *a priori* or *a posteriori*, a reprobation of men from eternity—I mean of all those who taste of such fruits—unless we will say, that when Jerusalem was laid waste by the Chaldeans, and burnt with fire, all the persons that were sufferers in this calamity were reprobated by God from eternity; although, in case this could be proved, (the contrary whereof, nevertheless, is evident from the Scriptures,) yet, were it no sufficient proof, that all that either perish by a temporal death, or deeply suffer otherwise in public desolations, are, therefore, reprobated by God from eternity, or perish eternally; 6th, The drift and scope of the Apostle in the context, formerly declared and asserted, doth noways require either a probation or supposition that Esau should be personally reprobated from eternity, but only that in his posterity, and those sad events which, according to the prediction of the divine oracle, were in after-times to befal them, he should be set forth, and prove a significant type of the spiritual and eternal misery of all those that should seek justification by the works of the law, or in a way of their own devising, and not submit unto the counsel, will, and good pleasure of God in this behalf—who hath consecrated the way of faith in his Son Jesus Christ, as the only means whereby justification is to be attained by man; 7th, His cordial and perfect reconcilement unto his works, so fully expressed as the Scripture recordeth—(Gen. xxxiii.) After the great and deep offence taken at him upon the occasion of his brother stepping in between him and home—as we use to say—in obtaining their father's blessing, is no light argument or testimony of his own reconciliation to God. 'For if ye forgive men their trespasses,' saith our Saviour, 'your Heavenly Father will also forgive you.' (Matt. vi. 14.) And though it should be granted that Jacob had not trespassed against him, or done him any real injury or wrong in intercepting his father's blessing, yet, it being such in Esau's apprehension, and the indignation conceived against him for it being as real, serious, and deep—as if it had been a real and high injury indeed—his gentle, sweet, and loving intreating of his brother after it, was every way equivalent to a real forgiveness, being a true and real reconcilement. Therefore, unless it can be proved that after this reconcilement with his brother, Esau returned with the dog to his vomit, or else continued in some course of impiety inconsistent with salvation formerly practised, there can be no competent ground assigned of his damnation, much less of his personal reprobation from eternity; 8th, If Isaac had understood the oracle delivered to his wife Rebecca, 'the elder shall serve the younger,' as

if it had imported that his elder son Esau had been reprobated by God from eternity, it is noways probable that he could have set his heart upon him, delight in him, or love him as he did. That terrible wrath of God, revealed from heaven against the son, in so signal a way and manner, could not but wholly quench all joy, pleasure, or contentment in the present, in relation to such a son; and unless we shall judge Isaac to have been a man extremely sensual, and inordinately given to his appetite, we cannot reasonably conceive that he could take any comfort or contentment in his son, or love him for his venison's sake, which yet the Scripture testifieth of him—(Gen. xxv. 28)—if he had certainly known, that God had from eternity irreversibly doomed him to the ceaseless, endless torments of eternal fire! 9th, It is noways probable, nor like unto one of the ways of the dispensations of God, that he should inform such parents who are righteous and holy—who had found special favour in his sight—whose comforts and peace his heart was set to promote and advance, that he had reprobated, from eternity, any of their children, and this whilst they were yet unborn. A message of such a sad and horrid import as this, coming from the mouth of God immediately to a weak and tender woman, whose hour of travail, and this with two children, was come, being likewise already sorely troubled and perplexed with the strangeness of her condition in respect of what the sensibility felt in her womb, could not, in all likelihood, but have caused abortion or preproperous travail, and endanger her life; therefore, certainly, God did not intend to signify unto Rebecca that she was ready to fall in travail of a reprobate —a child which he was peremptorily resolved to destroy with the dreadful vengeance of hell-fire! 10th, If God should have signified unto Rebecca, and by her unto Isaac, that her elder son had been reprobated by him from eternity, and, consequently, that there was no hope—no possibility of his repentance or salvation, must not this needs have been a grand discouragement unto them from lifting up so much as a prayer unto God for him, and so from all other endeavours and applications of themselves unto him, in order to his conversion and salvation? and thus God must be supposed to have taught astorgy and unnaturalness unto Isaac and Rebecca, yea, and taken them off from the performance of such duties, to, and on the behalf of, their child, which he strictly and universally imposeth upon all other parents, without exception, in reference unto their children; 11th, It was never known or heard of, that God ever made any discovery unto the world of any man's final estate, especially on the left hand, before he was born, no, nor yet before the

perpetration of some grand and horrid sin; 12th, and lastly, There is no end imaginable worthy the only wise and most gracious God, why, or for which, he should make known unto the world such a thing concerning Esau, being yet unborn, as that he had reprobated him from eternity. Such a revelation as this cannot well be supposed to be of any use or spiritual accommodation or edification to the world; but rather of evil tendency, and of a malignant influence upon the mind and hearts of men, as directly occasioning them to judge hardly and most unworthily of God, and to conceive of him as no faithful Creator, as having no care, no love, no bowels of compassion towards the best of the workmanship of his hands—man; not to mention that dragon's tail, I mean the long bead-roll of enormous notions and conceits which attends the doctrine of personal reprobation from eternity—the account thereof is to be seen elsewhere.* Whereas, on the other hand, if it be supposed, (as according to the truth and evident scope of the context it ought,) that by what God revealed unto Rebecca, and so unto the world, concerning Esau, being yet unborn, or his posterity in him, he signified and disclosed unto the world that they who should not submit unto his counsel and pleasure for their justification, and seek it by faith in Jesus Christ, should be for ever excluded from the heavenly inheritance. Such a discovery or revelation from him as this is apparently of a rich and blessed consequence and import unto men. To object that Esau is termed a 'profane person,' by the Holy Ghost, for selling his birthright for one morsel of meat, and 'that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected,' &c.—(Heb. xii. 16, 17, &c.)—amounts to nothing of value for proof, that therefore Esau, before he was born, was discovered by God unto his mother to have been a reprobate from eternity. The utmost that can be conceived to be so much as hinted in this passage is, that being a profane person when he sold his birthright, he was out of the favour of God, and that his rejection by his father Isaac in that ardent and passionate suit which he made unto him for the blessing of the first-born, was a presage or item unto him that he would be everlastingly rejected by God, unless he repented of his profaneness, and sought the favour of God by faith in Jesus Christ. That repentance for which he is said to have 'found no place, though he sought it carefully with tears,' is not meant of his own repentance, as if he could have found no place for this, 'though he sought it carefully with tears,' but of the repentance of

* *Ειρηνομαχια*, or Agreement and Distance of Brethren, pp. 3—5, &c.

his father: the meaning being, that though he most affectionately desired his father to recall that blessing which he had conferred upon his younger brother, and to settle it upon him, yet he could not prevail with him to do it, or to change his mind in that behalf. 'I have eaten of all,' saith Isaac unto Esau, 'before thou camest, and have blessed him; yea, and he SHALL be blest'—(Gen. xxvii. 33); meaning that he neither would nor could recall that which, by the motion of the Spirit of God, was gone out of his lips, in blessing his brother Jacob. And thus we have proved at large the former of the two particulars which were propounded, namely, that the Apostle, in the passage now before us, and in what he discourseth concerning Jacob and Esau, intended to show and prove who and what manner of persons they are whom God accounteth for Abraham's seed, and persons justified, namely, such who seek their justification by faith, and not by the deeds of the law."—*Goodwin on the 9th of Romans.* In this passage, therefore, rightly understood, the doctrine of Calvinistic election and reprobation is not to be found. In confirmation of this, we request you to read, in connection with the above, the following verses from this chapter, viz.: —from the 14th to the 16th, and you will find that they are adduced in evidence and illustration of the sense fixed at present to the case of Jacob and Esau.

Let us now proceed to examine the next passage in which the doctrine of eternal election and reprobation of persons to life and damnation is supposed to be found, and it reads thus: "For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth."—Ver. 17, 18. "Here, therefore," say our highly respected brethren, "the doctrine for which we contend is established beyond all controversy, for it is plainly said that Pharaoh was made on purpose by the Almighty to be damned, and was damned accordingly." Stay, stay, friends, we think the passage says no such thing. In order, however, to understand it rightly, we should go back to the history of this man, to which obviously the Apostle refers, and we shall find it in Exodus, chap. ix. ver. 13—21, and is recorded in the following clear terms: "And the Lord said unto Moses, rise up early in the morning and stand before Pharaoh, and say unto him, thus saith the Lord God of the Hebrews, let my people go, that they may serve me; for I will at this time send all my plagues upon thine house, and upon thy *servants*, and upon thy *people*; that thou

mayest know that there is none like me in all the earth. For now I will stretch out my hand that I may smite thee and thy people with pestilence; and thou shalt be cut off from the earth. And in very deed for *this cause have I raised thee up* for to shew in thee my power; and that my name may be declared throughout the earth: as yet exaltest thou thyself against my people, and thou wilt not let them go? Behold, tomorrow about this time I will cause it to rain a very grievous hail, such as hath not been in Egypt since the foundation thereof even until now. Send therefore now, and gather thy cattle and all that thou hast in the field; for upon every man and every beast which shall be found in the field, and shall not be brought home, the hail shall come down upon them, and they shall die. He that feared the word of the Lord among the servants of Pharaoh made his servants and his cattle flee into the houses; and he that regarded not the word of the Lord left his servants and his cattle in the fields." This is the history from whence the Apostle quotes. Let us now inquire,—

1st, Who this Pharaoh was. This is important and necessary, as the entire history recorded in the book of Exodus might lead a superficial reader of it to conclude that there is but one only person spoken of throughout, and that the same identical man reigned in Egypt from the death of Joseph to the overthrow in the Red Sea—a period of about 500 years. This conclusion, however, will be found at variance with historical facts; for it is evident that the book of Exodus contains the history of at least *three* bearing the same name. The first of that name was apparently a good man; in his days, and under his reign, there was peace and tranquillity throughout the land of Egypt. Nothing went amiss with the stems of Jacob; all of them, from the highest to the lowest, fared well for Joseph's sake; and the Egyptians among whom they sojourned did not envy or repine at their prosperity. It seems, however, that this gracious king died about the same time, or soon after Joseph's death; for Moses tells us, in chap. i. verse 8th, "there arose a new king which knew not Joseph;" that is, either had no memorial record, or took no notice how well he had deserved both of the king and kingdom of Egypt; "and he said," that is, the second Pharaoh, "unto his people, behold, the people of the children of Israel are more and mightier than we; come on, let us deal wisely with them," and so on. This Pharaoh is charged with originating and perpetrating an act as wicked, as cruel, as malignant, as tyrannical, and bloody! as the third one will be found to do, and yet there is not a word! by our good friends, about his eternal repro-

bation. Josephus, however, in his Second Book of Antiquities, tells us, "that this latter Pharaoh," or, as Moses terms him, the "new king," "was of another line; that he was no son nor heir of the former, unless by adoption, but at the best of some collateral line;" and, in Book viii. chap. 6, of his Antiquities, he farther informs us that "the title of Pharaoh was applied to the kings of Egypt, from Menes to the time of Solomon, but not afterwards; the word signifying a *king* in the Egyptian language." And Calmet remarks, on this subject, "hence it appears that Pharaoh is a title signifying dignity, honour, exaltation;" and asks, "may it not be analogous to the title of HIGHNESS among ourselves? If so, we may discover the true sense of the expression in Exod. ix. 16, "for this cause have I raised thee up"—a term of words perfectly agreeable to the Eastern modes of speech—*q. d.* "I HAVE RAISED YOUR HIGHNESS TO YOUR HEIGHT, that in spite of your height *in your very face I might display my power.*"

Let us now endeavour to keep these men properly and distinctly in view. The first who bore the name was a good man, and died about the time that Joseph died. The second was a cruel tyrant, who caused the subjection of Israel to servitude, and murdered their children. In this person's days Moses was born, and was (mysterious) brought up in his palace. He was as wicked and did as much as his successor to provoke God and annoy Israel; and yet, as we have already observed, there is not a word about his predestination to eternal ruin! The third is the object of our present remarks. He was the one who continued Israel's oppression—opposed their release from the land of Egypt, and was drowned in the Red Sea. 2d, Let us inquire, what was "the purpose" for which he is said to have been raised up? Calvinism answers at once, and tells us, that "it was for the purpose of inevitable destruction." But is there not a more intelligible and charitable solution than this to be found? to say nothing about its correctness. We think there is. Therefore let us endeavour to find it. In order to this let the following facts be kept in view:—1st, The *idolatry* of Egypt at the time when Moses and Aaron went there to emancipate the children of Israel; 2d, That the contest between the servants of God and Pharaoh and his magicians was a contest of principles; that is to say, Pharaoh wished to establish idolatry as the religion of the land, and thereby exclude the very name and idea of God from all his dominions; Moses and Aaron, on the other hand, wished the overthrow of idolatry, and the establishing of the old and true religion therein. These facts will explain to you the design of the

many miracles that were wrought by the hands of Moses and Aaron, together with the extreme obstinacy of Pharaoh, and those who acted with him, on the other hand. In connection with the above, take another, namely, that the battle fought on the celebrated arena was to decide either the speedy deliverance of the children of Israel, or their eternal thraldom. Pharaoh contended, of course, for the latter; because of the many advantages that accrued to him from the labour and service of these his slaves! and Moses and Aaron contended for the former, that Israel might be brought to the promised land, and that the true religion might remain behind them in the land of Egypt. Upon the whole subject, that is, on the above, and on Pharaoh being raised up for this purpose, and his hardening, &c., we offer the following remarks, which, if properly weighed, understood, and recollected, will, we trust, explain the whole case to you:—Then let us observe, 1st, That in all this time, or in all the instructions given by God to Moses (Exod. iii.), there is no mention of God's purpose or menacing to *harden* Pharaoh, but only a divine prediction that Pharaoh *would not let Israel go;* and yet he at length be as willing to let this people of God depart as Pharaoh's people should be to bestow their jewels, and other rich presents, upon them. The miracles which Moses was for the present and afterwards authorised and enabled to work, both in the sight of his own people, and in the presence of Pharaoh, were, as *authentic letters of credence*, legible enough to the Egyptians, that the Lord of Hosts had designed him unto this embassage, and given him power to command all the hosts of reasonless creatures to fight for Israel against the Egyptians. All the several armies of inferior creatures, which brought the many ensuing plagues upon the Egyptians, were but as so many fingers of that mighty hand, by whose strength God had lately foretold Moses that Pharaoh would in the issue be content to let the Israelites depart, upon fair terms, out of his land; 2d, The former Pharaoh, and his predecessor, (according to the apprehension of their proud imaginations,) had played the fore-game so cunningly against the seed of Jacob that this present or later Pharaoh at least thought himself sure of winning the set, or of drawing the whole stake about which the controversy was; and that was *the present liberty*, or *perpetual thraldom*, of Israel. Now, God instructs his ambassador Moses to play the after-game with such skill and circumspection, that unless Pharaoh would give over in good time, he should be sure to lose his own life, and the life of his princes or chief commanders in war; besides the loss of every first-born male in Egypt, whether of man or beast;

and also the loss of the greatest part of that year's revenue of the whole land of Egypt. Pharaoh in all this process demeans himself, first like a bold, then like a wilful chaffing gamester, who, after once he has begun to *vie* with, or provoke his adversary, resolves to *revie* with him, and to provoke him further when the game is desperate, as will further appear in his answer to every several message delivered unto him from God by Moses and Aaron; 3d, The sum or abstract of the fourth chapter contains Moses' debate with God, or humble entreaty to be spared from this *great service*, in respect of his slowness of speech, and insufficiency, (as he took it,) to be his ambassador. And in this mind he continued until God himself did overawe him by his authority, and yet withal gently persuade him by reason. "Then the Lord was very angry with Moses, and said, do not I know Aaron thy brother the Levite that he himself shall speak? for so he cometh also forth to meet thee; and when he seeth thee he will be glad in his heart. Therefore thou shalt speak unto him, and put the words in his mouth; and I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye ought to do; and he shall be thy spokesman unto the people; and he shall be, even he shall be as thy mouth, and thou shalt be to him as God."—Chap. iv. 14—16. The reason which specially moved Moses to undertake this service is expressed, verse 19, "for the Lord had said unto Moses, in the land of Midian, go, return to Egypt; for they are all dead which went about to kill thee; then Moses took his wife, and his sons, and returned toward the land of Egypt," &c. The instruction for his embassage, undertaken upon these motives, follows, verses 21—23, "and the Lord said unto Moses, when thou art entered and come into Egypt again, see that thou do all the wonders before Pharaoh, which I have put in thine hand; but I will harden his heart, and he shall not let the people go. Then shalt thou say to Pharaoh, thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even my *first-born*. Wherefore I say to thee, let my son go, that he may serve me; if thou refuse to let him go, behold, I will slay thy son, even thy first-born." This passage contains the first mention either of God's purpose or prediction to harden the heart of Pharaoh; 4th, Upon Moses and Aaron's meeting in the mount of God, not by human compact or contrivance, but by God's special appointment, and upon the sight of the miracles which God enabled Moses first to work in private, the people of Israel believed that the Lord had visited the children of Israel, and had looked down upon their tribulation; and, upon this belief, "they bowed down and worshipped."—Exod. iv. 31. Now, upon

this consent and obedience unto their proposal, Moses and Aaron went and said to Pharaoh, (like ambassadors of state,) "let my people go, that they may celebrate a feast unto me in the wilderness. And Pharaoh said, who is the Lord, that I should hear his voice, and let Israel go? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go," &c.—Chap. v. 12. Unless the former bent of Pharaoh's pride and avarice had taken occasion to enlarge and stiffen itself, from this fair message delivered unto him, he would not have returned this haughty supercilious answer unto Moses, God's ambassador, and Aaron, his interpreter, "Moses and Aaron, why cause ye the people to cease from their works? get you to your burdens." —Chap. v. 4. Nor was his choler or superciliousness only against Moses, but against the whole people of Israel, on whose behalf God had made them his ambassadors; for, Pharaoh said, furthermore, "behold, much people is now in the land, and ye make them leave their burdens. Therefore Pharaoh gave commandment the same day unto the taskmasters of the people, and to their officers, saying, ye shall give the people no more straw to make brick, (as in time past,) but let them go and gather them straw themselves. Notwithstanding lay upon them the number of brick which they made in time past, diminish nothing thereof; for they be idle, therefore they cry, saying, let us go to offer sacrifice unto our God. Lay more work upon the men, and cause them to do it, and let them not regard vain words"—Chap. v. 5—9; 5th, That which did most discourage Moses from having any more to deal with Pharaoh, was his experience of his uninclinable disposition to any good motion which he could make on the behalf of God's people. And this diffidence or backwardness in Moses received nutriment from the wayward and grumbling disposition of the Israelitish people against him and Aaron. After Pharaoh had given them a peremptory charge to perform the same task, which they had done before when they had allowance of straw from the Egyptians, then the officers of the children of Israel saw themselves in an evil case, because it was said, "ye shall diminish nothing of your brick, nor of every day's task. And they met Moses and Aaron, who stood in the way as they came forth from Pharaoh; and they said unto them, the Lord look upon you, and judge, because you have made our savour to be abhorred in the eyes of Pharaoh, and in the eyes of his servants, to put a sword in their hands to slay us."—Verses 19—21. After the Lord had given Moses more special instructions, and new encouragements—chap. vi. verse 1—and laid a stronger tie upon him and Aaron to deliver his message unto Pharaoh, than he did upon

Pharaoh to obey it; "and the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, go in, speak unto Pharaoh, king of Egypt, that he let the children of Israel go out of his land. And Moses spake before the Lord, saying, behold, the children of Israel have not hearkened unto me; how then shall Pharaoh hear me, who am of uncircumcised lips? And the Lord spake unto Moses, and unto Aaron, and gave them a charge unto the children of Israel, and unto Pharaoh, king of Egypt, to bring the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt."—Verses 10—13. Yet this charge doth not altogether charm Moses' muttering; for he takes up, as it seems, the same note again, verse 30, "then Moses said before the Lord, behold, I am of uncircumcised lips, and how shall Pharaoh hearken unto me?" But perhaps this last clause might be a mere repetition of the former, interserted by Moses, the writer of this story, rather than a reiteration or resumption of the former complaint, or matter of grievance. Unto this conjecture I should the more incline, had not the Lord given Moses a second encouragement, much different from the former, immediately after the repetition or resumption mentioned—chap. vi. verse last—for so it follows in the next words, chap. vii. ver. 1, 2, "then the Lord said to Moses, behold, I have made thee Pharaoh's God, and Aaron, thy brother, shall be thy prophet. Thou shalt speak all that I command thee, and Aaron, thy brother, shall speak unto Pharaoh, that he send the children of Israel out of his land." Here was a great encouragement to undertake so hard a service. But what encouragement could either Moses or Aaron take from the passage of God's instruction, or declaration of his will, unto them? verse 3, "but I will harden Pharaoh's heart, and multiply my miracles, and my wonders, in the land of Egypt." This is a question worth the asking, and the resolution of it worth considering. For that which most discouraged Moses from obeying the Lord's commands, was his suspicion or presumption that Pharaoh would not hearken to him, nor regard his signs, as equivalent to letters of credence. How then should he take heart and courage by knowing that perfectly which before he did but suspect or fear? to wit, that Pharaoh would not, or that he could not, hearken to him. Now, thus much Moses could not but know, from God's own declaration of his purpose to harden the heart of Pharaoh—verses 3, 4, &c.—and this question will beget a second, on whose resolution the clearing of the main difficulty will most depend; this second question or query is, what manner of hardening the Lord meant in the forecited verse 3d? whether he meant a *positive* and direct hardening, by way of *necessary causuality*, or physical determination of

Pharaoh's will or spirit unto obstinacy, or unrelenting stubbornness, (at least from the date of God's forementioned declaration of his will unto this purpose,) or a *privative*, or some other way? 6th, This question is so *captious*, that it is incapable of any one punctual answer, whether affirmative or negative. The best is, that the whole knot may be clearly dissolved by distinguishing the differences of *time*, or several *treaties*, between Moses and Pharaoh. In respect of the three or four last signs, and the treaties upon them, this affirmative answer is punctual; Pharaoh's heart was positively hardened by God, or rather infatuated by means extraordinary, and altogether unusual, unless in two or three like extraordinary cases. In respect of the five or six first signs or miracles wrought by Moses and Aaron in the sight of Pharaoh, this *negative* answer is punctual; Pharaoh's heart was not hardened by God, either positively or directly, much less irresistibly. The means or manner how his heart became hardened were but ordinary; only by Moses' proposal of such conditions unto him, as his proud heart was naturally averse from; and by pressing him to grant them in such a manner as provoked his avaricious mind to resist and deny them. The true tenor of God's former speech to Moses is but this: "If Pharaoh will not hearken unto thee, nor let my people go upon the sight of the first signs and wonders which thou shalt be enabled to work before him and his people, let not this dismay thee, or make thee give over thy charge; for the longer he is or shall be in yielding, the greater will be thy victory, and his case the harder: for assure thyself, in the end he shall be willing to let thee go, both he and his people shall entreat you to begone out of their coasts; I will multiply my signs so fast upon them, that Egypt and all other nations shall be taught to know who is the Lord, even the Lord God of the Hebrews and of Israel." 7th, But more particularly to revise the characters of *Mosaiacal expressions*, how Pharaoh's heart, upon the sight of Moses' signs and miracles, became hardened by several degrees. Upon the exhibition of the first wonder, which was the turning of Aaron's rod into a serpent, it is thus written, "so Pharaoh's heart was hardened, and he hearkened not to them as the Lord had said."—Chap. vii. verse 13. This phrase, "Pharaoh's heart was hardened," may refer more properly to Aaron than unto *God as the agent*, if the speech be to be construed *personally*, or otherwise to *Aaron's rod*, or to the sign or wonder itself; in which there was no such extraordinary force as would have inclined an unregenerate man's heart, though by nature and habit no way so stubborn as Pharaoh's was, to have yielded forthwith to Moses'

requests or demands, seeing the magicians of Egypt did the like. This only may be said, that the devouring of the magicians' rods turned into serpents, by Aaron's rod first so turned, was very *ominous*—so ominous as the observation of it could not but either *mollify* or harden Pharaoh's heart, as very likely it did both, according to the several times or vicissitudes of reflecting upon it; for his heart and desires being once drawn a little from their natural *bent* by the sight of this wonder, but not fully broken, must either stand at the point to which they were drawn, or return with greater violence to their former station. The Lord, speaking in his own person to Moses, verse 14, saith not, "*I have hardened Pharaoh's heart,*" but "*Pharaoh's heart is hardened, he refuseth to let the people go;*" which can imply no other hardening than such as did result or rebound upon the sight or consideration of the wonder. Upon the exhibition of the second sign, to wit, the turning of the waters into blood—which was somewhat more fearful than the former—Moses' expression of Pharaoh's disposition is *impersonal.* Verse 22, "and Pharaoh's heart was hardened;" and it was no extraordinary wonder that his heart should be hardened again in such a time, or after such a manner, as it was upon the sight of the first wonder, seeing the magicians or sorcerers did the like; thus much only may seem extraordinary, or to convey the matter in favour of Moses or Aaron, in that this plague could not be removed by any magician's spell or skill in sorcery, but only by *Moses' prayers to God.* This might well have wrought relentance in any ordinary heathen prince, which had but the patience to take the circumstances into consideration. But the Holy Ghost gives the true reason why, and by what means, Pharaoh's heart was hardened at this time. Verse 23d, "And Pharaoh turned and went into his house, *neither* DID HE SET HIS HEART *to this also:*" and his not setting his heart to this wonder, with its circumstances, did bring a necessity upon him to have his heart hardened in some further degree than it had been with the first wonder. But Pharaoh was more terrified with the sight of the frogs; which, notwithstanding the Egyptian magicians did by sorcery produce, or at least which Pharaoh, their master, was persuaded they did. But the production could not be without his help, nor the persuasion but by his permission or sufferance, who had enabled Moses to do this strange work, in which this is most remarkable, that Pharaoh should so earnestly entreat Moses and Aaron to remove this plague, or to confine the frogs to the river only. Verse 8. "Then Pharaoh called for Moses and Aaron and said, entreat the Lord that he may take

away the frogs from me, and from my people, *and I will let the people go*, that they may do sacrifice unto the Lord." With this request Moses and Aaron complied.—See ver. 9—11. But this relentance in Pharaoh, though real and sincere at the time, was but "like the morning dew," it soon passed away. Had he only *continued* in it and increased it by prayer, which is the only way to do with all the graces that are imparted, he and his people would have been then and there *saved*. Instead of this we read, "but when Pharaoh saw that there was respite, *he hardened his heart*, and hearkened not unto them as the Lord had said."—Verse 15. This cannot be understood, save only of such an *indirect* or concomitant obduration, as hath been already shown, that is, a resumption of his former proud and avaricious resolutions, the result of which could be no other but a measure of induration so much greater than the former that had befallen him, by how much the sight of the frogs had mollified his heart more than the two former miracles had done; yet doth not Pharaoh, upon the sight of any of these three, betray such a stubborn wilful disposition as he did upon the exhibition of the *fourth miracle*, which his enchanters did plainly confess surpassed their skill. Chap. viii. 18, 19, "And the magicians did go with their enchantments to bring forth lice, but they could not; so there were lice upon man and upon beast. Then the magicians said unto Pharaoh, this is THE FINGER OF GOD: and Pharaoh's heart was hardened, and he hearkened not unto them as the Lord had said." The finger of God then was remarkable in *working the miracle* which the magicians could not; but no way concerned in *hardening Pharaoh's heart*. Nor is it either said or intimated, that the finger of God did harden Pharaoh's heart, but Pharaoh's heart remained obstinate, "and he hearkened not unto them as the Lord had said."—Verse 19. His not hearkening unto them, was the cause of his induration. In the remainder of this chapter we have an account of additional plagues that were thronged upon Pharaoh, together with a development of his low and cunning disposition; and it is remarkable, that the miracles now wrought assumed a severer aspect than the former ones had done. The plague of the murrain on the cattle, however, affected him so far as to induce him to believe the prediction of Moses and Aaron concerning it, for he now sent into Goshen to learn the truth of it; that is, to know the truth respecting the statement made, "that there was not one of the cattle of Israel dead;"—chap. ix. ver. 7—and yet it follows in the same verse, "the heart of Pharaoh was hardened, and he did not let the people go;" 8th, All, or most of the former signs were re-

spectively more noisome and terrible, than detrimental, unto Pharaoh and his people. We do not read before this time of the death or destruction of any useful creatures, besides of fishes, when the waters were turned into blood; and this calamity was neither so grievous nor so universal, as the murrain of cattle was. It extended only to that part of the river, or those waters that were nigh to Pharaoh's court; otherwise the magicians or enchanters could have had no place to practise their skill in. But this murrain of the most useful creatures was very general; nor would the magicians have attempted the like if it had been apprehended as feasible by them, seeing both the Egyptians and themselves should have been greater losers by the practice of their own cunning. But seeing this plague did not infect Pharaoh's coffers or treasure-cities, which the Israelites were enjoined to build, or prepare materials for building, nor yet his chariots or stables, hence haply it is, that he is not so much affected with the wonder as he had been with the former, and yet because this wonder did give little or no check unto his proud stubborn thoughts, the Lord instantly, and without further commission, commands Moses to bring another plague upon the Egyptians more terrible and noisome than any of the rest had been: this was the plague of "boils breaking out with blains upon man and beast," &c., as recorded in the 8th, 10th, and 11th verses; and whether Pharaoh did resume or continue his former resolutions without any relentance the text is silent, but expressive enough to this purpose, that the Lord did FROM THIS TIME harden the heart of Pharaoh after a more extraordinary manner than it had been hardened before: for so the words run in verse 12, "and the Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh, and he hearkened not unto them as the Lord had spoken unto Moses." But what was it that the Lord had spoken unto Moses? or where did he specially speak to this purpose? The place where these words, "as the Lord had spoken unto Moses," are recorded, is Exodus iv. 21; "and the Lord said unto Moses," &c. In most of the former treaties between Moses and Pharaoh, or in the relation of the success or effect of his speech or works, this epiphonema or close comes often in, "that Pharaoh hearkened not to Moses and Aaron as the Lord had spoken;" but in none of them besides this present is it so expressly added, that "the Lord did harden the heart of Pharaoh, as he had spoken unto Moses." This different character of this close from the rest, gives us to understand that this plague of blains was *the first of all the plagues* in which *the Lord had hardened* the heart of Pharaoh after an extraordinary manner. Let us, however, ask,

after what manner did he now harden it? This, my friends, is the main question upon which the whole of our dispute hangs. Calvin himself, in his note on the place, admits "that it was God's withholding or *withdrawing* his grace, and Pharaoh hardened *himself*." It is demonstrably clear that the Lord hardened it not by the infusion of any bad quality or new unhallowed resolutions, but *by giving him up to his own lusts*; and this, after he had *rejected* offered mercy and saving grace again and again, as we have now shown at large. From this time, (bear it well in mind,) and not before, doth that of our Apostle's commence, or begin to take place, namely, "for this very purpose have I raised thee up," &c. Now thus to infatuate Pharaoh, or suffer him to infatuate himself after he had so often hardened his own heart and slighted God's warnings, was a true ACT OF JUSTICE, which is the whole that is meant by Moses and Paul, or rather by the Holy Ghost, in the phraseology employed; and even the heathens, out of their broken speculations of divine providence, have observed, *quos jupiter nul perdere prius dementat;* infatuation is commonly the usher of fearful destruction. We have now examined the case of Pharaoh, and have likewise explained the phraseology at some length, and the result is, that Pharaoh was not a reprobate from all eternity: quite on the contrary, he might have been saved as well as any other sinner may, and would have been saved had he made the use which God intended him to have made of the abundant privileges brought to him, and pressed upon his acceptance, by these servants of the Lord. That he became a reprobate after a fair and sufficient trial is at once admitted; and was then given up to the hardness of his heart, and probably perished everlastingly, as will all and every other sinner that rejects the grace of God. "God's Spirit will not always strive with impenitent men"—he will withdraw and cease his operations on those hearts that refuse to comply. For the further clearing of this phrase, "whom he will he hardeneth," let us examine its process in other men that are said to be hardened by God. The very learned Dr. Gouge, in his celebrated Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, has the following remarks on

"GOD'S HARDENING MAN'S HEART."

"God," says he, "is said to harden as a judge, inflicting hardness of heart as a punishment.—Rom. i. 24. Now because man wittingly (willingly) did that which deserves that punishment, he hardens his own heart, even as a thief, who is condemned by the judge, may be said to hang himself. That God's justice may in this point be more clearly manifested, observe the particular respects wherein God is

said to harden man's heart. They are these,—1st, In that all actions and motions (as they are actions and motions) come from God, as our very being doth; *for in him we live, and move, and have our being.*—Acts xvii. 28. But the pravity of the action or motion cometh from man; therefore man properly hardeneth himself; 2d, In that God hinders not men from doing that which hardeneth; but God is the most high Supreme Sovereign; there is none above him to bind him to do any thing. He being not found to hinder men from doing what they do, who can, who shall blame him?—Mat. xx. 15. Man himself doth the very deed; 3d, In that he withholdeth or withdraweth his softening Spirit; for man's own spirit is a resisting spirit.—Acts vii. 51. It must be a higher and stronger spirit which keepeth man's spirit in compass. But God's withholding or withdrawing his Spirit is in justice for some sin of man; 4th, In that God offereth the occasions whereby man's heart is hardened, as his word, sacraments, mercies, judgments, miracles, and such like. But these occasions are in themselves good; their proper end is to soften. It is by man's perverting them that they harden; man, in this case, is like the spider that sucketh poison out of sweet flowers; 5th, In that God giveth over to Satan, who hardeneth man's heart. But God doth this as a just Judge, Satan being his executioner. Man himself brings this judgment upon himself."—*See Dr. Gouge on the Hebrews, and Dr. Thomas Jackson on the Priesthood of Christ.*

So far is God, therefore, from being the author of this sin, as Calvinism would lead us to suppose, that he really hardens none but those who wilfully harden themselves. The remainder of this sublime epistle may now be dispatched in a few words. Throughout the tenth and eleventh chapter the Apostle alternately addresses the Jews and the Gentiles. He predicts the fall of the former by their unbelief, and the elevation of the latter by the mere mercy of God through faith in Christ into an enjoyment of religious privileges, &c. One is admonished to use all caution to stand by faith, and are plainly told of the possibility of their falling from the same. The others are encouraged to return. And then, from the Old Testament Scriptures, the Apostle, in glowing terms, predicts the full restoration of the Jews and the remainder of the Gentiles, &c. The rest of the epistle, as you are aware, is purely practical, containing what might be termed the Apostle's ethics, left to this and to all other true Churches of Christ. And thus ends this epistle, which is too generally considered the stronghold of ultra-Calvinism, but without a vestige of the chilling doctrine of eternal, unconditional election

and reprobation. We may now, we presume, content ourselves with a mere glance at the epistle to the Ephesians. In reading this, however, you will perceive that the terms "elect, predestinated," &c., are employed therein; but, observe, they are employed in reference to every individual composing that Church, many of whom at that time and afterwards were notoriously wicked. The Apostle entertained serious doubts respecting their salvation, either present or final; yet are all the terms specified applied to them indiscriminately. Hence the election of the Ephesian Church, composed principally of Gentiles, was clearly a *national* election: as a nation were they elected to the enjoyment of the gospel and its abundant privileges. With this key in your hand you may proceed to the examination of the entire epistle at your leisure; and we are persuaded that the result of your examination will be, that there is not the slightest ground for the unhappy conclusion, that some men are doomed to damnation before they were born, and others unconditionally elected to life eternal. Nothing of this is found throughout the epistle. Having therefore, we fear, exceeded our limits, and thereby taxed your patience in our lengthened analysis of the epistle to the Romans, and having dwelt rather long on some of the passages therein contained, &c., we must reluctantly forbear entering into an examination of this epistle. We may do so with much safety, convinced that were we to do so, and investigate passage after passage of it, we should not only be more confirmed in our views of this doctrine, but also find that the contrary doctrines of eternal, personal, and unconditional election and reprobation has no foundation whatever in it.

CHAP. VIII.

CALVINISTIC ELECTION AND REPROBATION AT VARIANCE WITH THE RIGHT AND PROPER MEANING OF THE TERMS ELECTION AND REPROBATION.

Two things are not only of great importance in the right understanding of every part of the Sacred Volume, but are for that purpose indispensably necessary. The first of these requisites is a right understanding of the real, definite, and grammatical meaning of words; and the second is the way in which the writers themselves wish them understood; or, in other words, the way in which

they have employed them. Want of due attention to the above rule has been the origin of many egregious errors among the interpreters of the Word of God; and the sacred writers have been made too often to speak a language which they doubtless never intended to have employed; and an interpretation has consequently been given of their words and sentiments which they themselves would have blushed at the sight or hearing of. The terms before us are in point. Were we to ask our Calvinistic brethren the meaning of the words *election* and *reprobation*, together with their application to men? the answer would in substance be this, "election means the setting apart certain men in the counsels of eternity to be unconditionally saved and brought to glory; and reprobation simply means the rejecting and foreordaining of all others to inevitable damnation; and all this done ages many before either of the parties were born, or had done good or evil, and without the slightest regard being paid to the obedient faith of one or to the wilfully obstinate unbelief of the other," &c. This, my friends, is the way in which the words now under consideration are interpreted and explained by our Calvinian brethren. All is done in eternity; and nothing can be altered afterward, as has been already sufficiently shown in our quotations from their own authors in pages 12 to 21, to which now turn and read. But what is the real, definite, and grammatical meaning of these words? and how are they respectively employed in the Word of God? In the solution of these mighty questions we shall endeavour now, as we have done all along, to keep an eye to the *truth;* and thus try to give you the true sense of them. Let us begin with the word reprobation. The word signifies the act of abandoning, or a state of being abandoned to eternal destruction; or a condemnatory sentence. A reprobate, means "a person lost to all virtue, or a wretch abandoned to wickedness." If the sense of the verb *reprobo*, in Ainsworth's Latin Dictionary, is correct, from whence ours to reprobate is derived, the meaning is the same as "to disallow, to reject, to reprove, to mislike." The word reprobate is used in the Bible about half a dozen times; and in every instance is used to denote a rejection AFTER *a fair trial.* The word is found in the following places:—See Jer. vi. 30; Rom. i. 28; 2 Cor. xiii. 5; 2 Tim. iii. 8; and Tit. i. 16. That eminent critic, Dr. Macknight, (a distinguished minister of the Established Church of Scotland,) has saved us the trouble of a critical examination of all the above passages in his learned Notes on Rom. i. 28, and 2 Cor. xiii. 5, which we shall now insert; and no doubt they will be found to

contain a sufficient explanation of this word. The following is his translation of Rom. i. 28:—"And as they did not *approve of holding* God *with acknowledgment*, God delivered them over to an *unapproving* mind to *work* those things which are not *suitable*." And his note on the first clause is this: "And as (ουκ εδοκιμασαν) they did not approve, so the word δοκιμαζειν may be translated; for it signifies *to try* metals, in order to distinguish the good from the bad; consequently, *to approve* what is found good after trial; and simply *to try*." The next place where the word is found is 2 Cor. xiii. 5, "*Try* yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove *yourselves;* know ye not *yourselves that* Jesus Christ is (εν) *among* you? *unless perhaps* ye be *without proof*." The learned note is as follows:—"Though we should be (ὡς αδοκιμοι) indeed without proof"—"without that proof of our Apostleship which would be given to you, were we miraculously to punish the obstinate offenders among you. That in this passage the word αδοκιμοι signifies *persons without proof*, and not *reprobates*, every reader must see, when he considers that the Corinthians doing that which was good could not have any influence to render the Apostle a reprobate in the modern sense of the word. And even though it could have had that influence, is it to be supposed that the Apostle would have consented to be made a reprobate in order that the Corinthians might do that which was good? In the language of modern times, a reprobate is one who is excluded from the possibility of salvation by an absolute decree of God; one who is delivered over to perdition. But NO WHERE IN SCRIPTURE *is the word* αδικιμος *used in that sense*."—*Macknight on the Epistles.* Read the whole of his note in this place, and consult him carefully in all the passages quoted above. What now is to become of the Calvinian doctrine of reprobation as held by some divines? yes, we triumphantly ask, what now becomes of it? for we are faithfully and plainly told, "that no where in Scripture is the word used in that sense." Let the reader examine these passages, yea, *and the whole Bible*, and he will find that not one soul was ever reprobated but after a fair trial had been made of him in this world. Not one was ever sent into hell but actual rejecters of Christ; that is, those who criminally and wantonly refused his grace when sincerely offered, and repeatedly urged on their acceptance; "those mine enemies who *would not* have me to reign over them." And to talk of God reprobating men from all eternity, that is, when they were not in existence, neither in *en esse* or *en posse*, and before they had done either good or evil, is really to talk learned nonsense; for then there

were no men in existence *to try*—no offers of mercy *made* and *rejected.* Hence the Calvinian reprobation is a reprobation of nonentity! a reprobation of nothing at all!! "Aye, but," we are told, "all was done in the foreknowledge of God;" "God knew who the reprobates would be." What then? did the foreknowledge of God necessitate them to be such? or does the foreknowledge of God necessitate his actions? Will our revered brethren tell us how many things God foreknows that will never come to pass? To give one instance out of many that might be given on this subject. God knows distinctly that he could, if he chose, create another world alike, or perfectly dissimilar to the present one, and people it with beings similar or dissimilar to the present race of human beings! But will he create again because he knows that he can do it if he chooses? Let our Calvinian brethren dispassionately consider and answer us this question, or else cease to assert as they have done in reference to the doctrine of eternal, personal, and unconditional election and reprobation. Conditional reprobation, or rejecting men from the divine mercy because of their impenitence and refusal of salvation is a Scriptural doctrine; but to the unconditional, absolute reprobation of the rigid Calvinists, the following objections may be urged:—1st, It cannot be reconciled to the love of God—"God is love;" "he is loving to every man, and his tender mercies are over all his works;" 2d, Nor to the wisdom of God; for the bringing into being a vast number of intelligent creatures under a necessity of sinning, and of being eternally lost, teaches no moral lesson to the world; and contradicts all those notions of wisdom in the ends and processes of government which we are taught to look for, not only from natural reason, but from the Scriptures; 3d, Nor to the grace of God, which is so often magnified in the Scriptures; for doth it argue any sovereign or high strain, any superabounding richness of grace and mercy in any man, when ten thousand have equally offended him, only to pardon one or two of them? or in what sense has "the grace of God appeared unto all men," or even to the millionth part of them? 4th, Nor can this merciless reprobation be reconciled to any of those numerous passages in which Almighty God is represented as tenderly compassionate and pitiful to the worst and most unworthy of his creatures, even them who finally perish. "I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth," "being grieved at the hardness of their hearts." "How often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not." "The Lord is long-suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish;"

" or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?" 5th, It is as manifestly contrary to his justice. Here, indeed, we would not assume to measure this attribute of God by unauthorised human conceptions; but when God himself has appealed to those established notions of justice and equity, which have been received among all enlightened persons, in all ages, as the measure and rule of his own, we cannot be charged with this presumption. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" "Are not my ways equal? saith the Lord." We may then be bold to affirm, that justice and equity in God are what they are taken to be among reasonable men; and if all men everywhere would condemn it, as most contrary to justice and right, that a sovereign should condemn to death one or more of his subjects for not obeying laws which it is absolutely impossible for them, under any circumstances which they can possibly avail themselves of, to obey, and much more the greater part of his subjects; and to require them, on pain of aggravated punishment, to do something in order to the pardon and remission of their offences, which he knows they cannot do—say to stop the tide or to remove a mountain; it implies a charge as obviously unjust against God, who is "just in the judgment which he executeth," to suppose him to act precisely in the same manner in regard to those whom he has passed by and rejected, without any avoidable fault of their own; to destroy them by the simple rule of his own sovereignty, or, in other words, to show that he has power to do it. In whatever light the subject be viewed, no fault, in any right construction, can be chargeable upon the persons so punished, or, as we may rather say, *destroyed*, since punishment supposes a judicial proceeding, which this act shuts out; for either the reprobates are destroyed for a pure reason of sovereignty, without any reference to their sinfulness, and thus all *criminality* is left out of the consideration; or they are destroyed for the sin of Adam, to which they were not consenting; or for personal faults resulting from a corruption of nature which they brought into the world with them, and which God wills not to correct, and which they have no power to correct themselves. Every received notion of justice is thus violated. We grant, indeed, that some proceedings of the Almighty may appear at first to be irreconcilable with justice, which are not so; as that we should suffer pain and death, and be infected with a morally corrupt nature, in consequence of the transgression of our first progenitors; that children should suffer for their parents' faults in the ordinary course

of Providence; and that in general calamities the comparatively innocent should suffer the same evils as the guilty. But none of these are parallel cases; for the "free gift" has come upon all men "to justification of life" through "the righteousness" of the second Adam, so that the terms of our probation are but changed. None are doomed to inevitable ruin, or the above words of the Apostle, would have no meaning; and pain and death, as to all who avail themselves of the remedy, are made the instruments of a higher life, and of a superabounding grace through Christ. The same observation may be made as to children who suffer evil for their parents' faults. This circumstance alters the terms of their probation; but if every condition of probation leaves to men the possibility and the hope of eternal life, and the circumstances of all are balanced and weighed by him who administers the affairs of individuals on principles, the end of which is to turn all the evils of life into spiritual and higher blessings, there is, obviously, no impeachment of justice in the circumstances of the probation assigned to any person whatever. As to the innocent suffering equally with the guilty in general calamities, the persons so suffering are but comparatively innocent, and their personal transgressions against God deserve a higher punishment than any which this life witnesses; this may also as to them be overruled for merciful purposes, and a future life presents its manifold compensations. But as to the non-elect, the whole case, in this scheme of sovereign reprobation, or sovereign preterition, is supposed to be before us. Their state is fixed—their afflictions in this life will not in any instance be overruled for ends of edification and salvation; they are left under a necessity of sinning in every condition; and a future life presents no compensation, but a fearful looking for of fiery and quenchless indignation. It is surely not possible for the ingenuity of man to reconcile this to any notion of just government which has ever obtained; and by the established notions of justice and equity in human affairs, we are taught by the Scriptures themselves to judge of the Divine proceedings in all completely stated and comprehensible cases; 6th, Equally impossible is it to reconcile this notion to the *sincerity* of God in offering salvation by Christ to all who hear the gospel, of whom this scheme supposes the majority, or at least great numbers, to be among the reprobate. The gospel, as we have seen, is commanded to be preached *to every creature;* which publication of good news to every creature *is an offer of salvation* to every creature, accompanied with earnest invitations to embrace it, and admonitory comminations lest any should neglect and despise

it. But does it not involve a serious reflection upon the truth and sincerity of God which men ought to shudder at, to assume, that at the very time the gospel is thus preached, no part of this good news was ever designed to benefit the majority, or any great part, of those to whom it is addressed? that they to whom this love of God in Christ is proclaimed were never loved by God? that he has decreed that many to whom he offers salvation, and whom he invites to receive it, shall never be saved? and that he will consider their sins aggravated by rejecting that which they never could receive, and which he never designed them to receive? It is no answer to this to say that we also admit that the offers of mercy are made by God to many whom he, by virtue of his prescience, knows will never receive them. We grant this; but it is enough to reply, that in this case there is no *insincerity*. On the Calvinian scheme the offer of salvation is made to those for whose sins Christ made no atonement; on the other, he made atonement for the sins of all. On the former, the offer is made to those whom God never designed to embrace it; on the latter, to none but those whom God seriously and in truth wills that they should avail themselves of it; on one theory, the bar to the salvation of the non-elect lies in the want of a provided sacrifice for sin; on the other, it rests solely in men themselves; one consists, therefore, with a perfect sincerity of offer, the other cannot be maintained without bringing the sincerity of God into question, and fixing a stigma upon his moral truth; 7th, Unconditional reprobation cannot be reconciled with that frequent declaration of Scripture, that "God is no respecter of persons." This phrase, we grant, is not to be interpreted as though the bounties of the Almighty were dispensed in equal measures to his creatures. In the administration of favour there is place for the exercise of that prerogative which, in a just sense, is called the Sovereignty of God; but justice knows but of one rule; it is, in its nature, settled and fixed, and looks not at the *person*, but the *case*. To have respect of persons is a phrase, therefore, in Scripture, which sometimes refers to judicial proceedings, and signifies to judge from partiality and affection, and not upon the merits of the question. It is also used by St. Peter with reference to the acceptance of Cornelius: "of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Here it is clear, that to respect persons would be to reject or accept them without regard to their moral qualities, and on some national and other prejudice or partiality which forms no moral rule of any kind. But, if the doctrine of absolute election and reprobation be

true; if we are to understand that men like Jacob and Esau, in the Calvinistic construction of the passage, whilst in the womb of their mother, nay, from eternity, are loved and hated, elected or reprobated, before they have done "good or evil," then it necessarily follows, that there is precisely this kind of "respect of persons with God;" for his acceptance or rejection of men stands on some ground of aversion or dislike which cannot be resolved into any moral rule, and has no respect to the merits of the case itself; and if the Scripture affirms that there is no such respect of persons with God, then the doctrine which implies it is contradicted by inspired authority; 8th, The doctrine of which we are showing the difficulties, brings with it the repulsive and shocking opinion of the eternal punishment of infants. Some Calvinists have, indeed, to get rid of the difficulty, or rather to put it out of sight, consigned them to annihilation; but of the annihilation of any human being there is no intimation in the word of God. In order, therefore, to avoid the fearful consequence of admitting the punishment of beings innocent as to all actual sin, there is no other way than to suppose all children, dying in infancy, to be an elected portion of mankind, which, however, would be a mere hypothesis brought in to serve a theory without any evidence. That some of those who, as they suppose, are under this sentence of reprobation, die in their infancy, is, probably, what most Calvinists allow; and, if their doctrine be received, cannot be denied; and it follows, therefore, that all such infants are eternally lost. Now we know that infants are not lost, because our Lord gave it as a reason why little children ought not to be hindered from coming unto him, that "of such is the kingdom of heaven," on which Calvin himself remarks, "in this word, 'for of such is the kingdom of heaven,' Christ comprehends as well little children themselves, as those who in disposition resemble them. *Hae voce, tam parvulos, quam eorum similes, comprehendit.*"* We are assured of the salvation of infants also, because "the free gift has come upon all men to," in order to, "justification of life;" and because children are not capable of rejecting that blessing, and must, therefore, derive benefit from it. The point, also, on which we have just now touched, that "there is no respect of persons with God," demonstrates it; for, as it will be acknowledged, that some children dying in infancy, are saved, it must follow, from this principle and axiom in the divine government, that all infants are saved; for the case of all infants, as to innocence or guilt, sin or righteous-

* Ham. in Matt. xix. 13.

ness, being the same, and God, as a Judge, being no "respecter of persons," but regarding only the merits of the case, he cannot make this awful distinction as to them, that one part shall be eternally saved, and the other eternally lost. That doctrine, therefore, which implies the perdition of infants, cannot be congruous to the Scripture of truth, but is utterly abhorrent. Finally, not to multiply these instances of the difficulties which accompany the doctrine of absolute reprobation or of preterition, it destroys the end of punitive justice: that end can only be to deter men from offence, and to add strength to the law of God. But if the whole body of the reprobate are left to the influence of their fallen nature, without redemy, they cannot be deterred from sin by threats of inevitable punishment, nor can they ever submit to the dominion of the law of God: their doom is fixed, and threats and examples can avail nothing.—*See Watson's Theological Institutes,* Part ii. chap. 26.

We trust that now the real, definite, and scriptural meaning of the term reprobation is given: you distinctly perceive that it is applied to *actual rejecters of offered salvation.* Very little needs be said, in this place, on the term ELECTION. We shall therefore only just remark, that the following things are included it:—1st, The existence of character; 2d, An investigation of that character; 3d, An approval of that character so investigated. Every one that is said to be approved or elected of God are *penitent* and *believing*, as the following Scriptures abundantly prove:—See Psa. iv. 3; and lxv. 4; 2 Cor. vi. 17, 18; Acts xiii. 38, 39; 1 Pet. ii. 9, 10. The word "elect," is generally applied in the Bible to persons then dead and glorified, or to the living that were walking in the fear of God. What we mean therefore by these terms when applied to men's spiritual and eternal states is simply this, reprobates are those who have actually refused offered mercy, and continue their rebellion and unbelief until "God gave them up to a reprobate mind," &c. Elect are those who have obeyed the call—are saved by the grace of God, and "call upon him day and night." This seems to us to be the sum and substance of election and reprobation, or of God's decree; he has unalterably determined, on one hand, to save to eternal glory all those that believe on his Son, and, on the other, to reject and punish eternally all those that continue in unbelief. This has been plainly stated by Christ himself, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." Surely his words should be enough to settle this controversy. With us they are: we bow to his supreme authority.

CHAP. IX.

REASONS FOR REJECTING THE CALVINIAN DOCTRINE OF ELECTION AND REPROBATION.

1. Because it is not found in Scripture. There is really no authority for it in the word of God. That men are damned solely by virtue of God's decrees is a point that cannot be supported by the sacred Scriptures; nor that men are saved solely because they have been elected. Israel was elected, still many of them perished.—See Psa. lxxviii. 29—31. Judas was elected, and that by Christ himself; and yet I suppose that the most rigid stickler for the doctrine of personal and unconditional election, would hardly say that his election brought him to heaven. Men are saved by faith through grace; and damned solely and exclusively by unbelief. This is the uniform language of Scripture.

2. Because it is at variance with all the attributes of God. This is another reason why we reject what Mr. Calvin himself admitted to be "an horrible decree." The attributes of Jehovah are all perfect, right, and just; and they all operate *harmoniously* in the respective destinies of the human family, and each of them is brought to bear on the same. Lest we should exceed our limits, we shall refrain from a description and illustration of all the divine attributes; let us, however, instance his *Justice;* and you are all aware that our predestinarian brethren talk loud and long about God's justice and sovereignty, but alas! the language they have employed in setting forth these have too often represented them as the relentless caprice of a tyrant, rather than the equitable, just, and eternally righteous principles of these divine attributes. The Scriptures represent him unto us under the noble and majestic aspect of a "righteous and just being," and that in the sense in which we have already spoken of him: and thus said even Pharaoh of him, "the Lord is righteous, and I and my people are wicked"—Exodus ix. 27; so also said the princes and king of Israel, "the Lord is righteous."—2 Chron. xii. 6. Again, "will not the Judge of all the earth do right?" We answer, doubtless, he will, as he has ever done. He has done so in every instance, and will do so through all eternity. In addition to what has already been said of God's justice in connection with man's salvation—see pp. 70—74—

to which now turn and read, we would just remark, that if God permitted us to fall by the offence of one man, and that without our consent nor even our existence as human beings; and by his sovereign power bring upon us a calamity, in the origin and cause of which we had no part whatever, and this calamity be of such nature and consequence that, without an opposite remedy, eternal perdition must unavoidably follow; and to provide and apply that remedy to a few equally guilty with the rest, and refuse, by his own sovereign will and power, to provide and apply it to others, which refusal led and leads to inevitable damnation. We now ask, where does his *Justice* appear, or in what light does his sovereignty stand? Beyond all doubt not in a God-like aspect. And rigid Calvinism, which resolves the salvation of the few and the sure and unavoidable damnation of all the rest of mankind to these principles, should be eternally silent on the subject of God's justice and sovereignty, or else represent them in accordance with their revelation in his word; for their creed evidently represents him under the forbidding aspect of an unjust, merciless, and cruel tyrant! In reply to this we are not unfrequently asked this question, "has not God a right to do as he wills with his own?" We answer, no doubt; but what is meant by this question? Just this, according to genuine Calvinism, "that God has a right to make as many souls for hell and the devil as he thinks proper." If, however, we look attentively at the representations which he has been pleased to make of himself in the exercise of this prerogative in the affairs of his moral government, of which the human family forms a part, we must most decidedly say, that the answer returned by Calvinism to the question proposed is not the correct and right one; for we never find in the Scripture the slightest insinuation that God has ever asserted this prerogative in making one soul on purpose to be damned; the direct contrary is again and again asserted, and that too in the plainest and clearest terms. Take one instance: "For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ,"—1 Thes. v. 9; and with this agrees the answer to the first question in the Assembly's Catechism:—"What is the chief end of man? To glorify God and enjoy him for ever." Than which a sounder piece of theology could never have been penned. This, doubtless, is the chief end of every man. Thus saith the Lord Most Mighty, on the subject:—"For I have created him *for my* GLORY, I have formed him; yea, I have made him."—Isa. xliii. 7. We are again asked, "did not God pass by the angels that sinned against him, without providing a remedy for them: and might he not have passed by all

or any of the human family on the same principle?" In answer to this question we observe, that the cases brought forward are not parallel; for angels did not sin in a representative, but in their individual capacity; and this capacity at the time of transgression in a perfect state of maturity. Every one, therefore, of the angels *sinned for himself*, and, consequently, it was an act of justice, and that in the right sense of justice, to pass them by, and leave them without a remedy. Just, for example, is it an act of justice to punish a sinner of the human family when he has rejected offered mercy; but to treat the family of Adam in the same way, that is pass by all, or pass by any of them without providing a remedy, because their great founder and federal head had sinned, would not argue justice in the divine government at all, but positively the reverse.—*See Howe's Living Temple.*

3. We reject the doctrine of Calvinistic election and reprobation, because it is directly opposed to God's love and sincerity in his offers of grace to all men. Christ himself tells us, "that God so *loved the* WORLD that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Our predestinarian brethren, however, profess to assent to the truth contained in this passage; but their explanation of the term "world," as constituting the subjects of "God's love," is both curious and strange. They tell us, that by it we are exclusively to understand "*the elect world:*" that is, then, a world of believers. Short work, however, will do in this place. Let them produce a single passage from any part of the word of God where the term "world" is applied to the "elect," and when this is done the point disputed shall be given up on our part. Passages on the other side are at hand, where the "world" is held in contradistinction from the "elect." "Ye are not of the world," says Christ of his Church, "but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you," &c. &c. The elect of God are therefore clearly those that are chosen out of the world; that is, saved by the grace of God from the practice and life of wicked men, here called the world. They call upon God day and night, while the world lives prayerlessly; they are holy, being sprinkled with the blood of Christ; the world is unpardoned and unpurged, and therefore hating and persecuting God's dear children; they have put on Christ, and are wrestling with principalities and powers: "the world," on the other hand, "lieth in the arms of the wicked one." A strange place this truly for praying, holy people "to lie." Where will absurdities end? Besides, what is to become of the clause, "whosoever believeth in him shall

not perish?" If the term "world" in this passage is to be confined to the "elect," some of these may not believe, and consequently "perish;" for actual salvation obviously is coupled with "faith," or rather is suspended upon it as a condition in this, and all other passages of Scripture. And nothing is more easy of demonstration than the mournful fact, that all "the world" does not "believe on the Son of God," and are therefore under condemnation, and in danger of perishing everlastingly. It is not therefore merely because the world is "loved," that it must be saved, nor because it is hated that it must "perish:" men are saved by faith in Christ, and perish because they believe not in the only begotten Son of God. Look again at the expressions of the divine sincerity: the following are a few of them, a mere specimen of what the sacred volume contains on the subject:—"Look unto me *all the ends of the earth*, and be SAVED: for I am God, and there is none else." "Ho every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price." "As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked." "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together as a hen doth gather her chickens under her wings, *and ye would not!*" According to "the doctrine of the decrees," all this amounts to nothing less than to a solemn lie! for it is expressly admitted by some of her (Calvinian) divines, that God only calls to make the reprobates more deaf; and, consequently, that he must have pleasure in the death of every one of the reprobates! Therefore God says one thing, and means another, if Calvinism be true: a thought this the most unworthy the God of truth. If God has really passed by and foreordained the greatest part of mankind to unavoidable wrath, and yet solemnly asserts to them, as he must do, for his assertions are to *all*, that he has no pleasure in their death, and that he wills their repentance and salvation; what confidence can any one place in his most solemn declarations? or, rather, what a view does rigid Calvinism give us of God! The fact is, "he cannot lie; it is *impossible* for God to lie." There is a meaning in every word and sentence uttered by his eternal and unchangeable lips; and the real, definite, and fixed meaning is found in the words employed. He really and truly hath no pleasure in the death of any impenitent sinner. This is what God says, and is precisely what he means, as all his conduct towards them sufficiently demonstrates.—See Hos. xi. 8, 9.

4. We reject the doctrine of the "horrible decrees," because it is

at variance with the Scriptural representation of the atonement of Christ Jesus the Lord. Every page in the Bible that speaks of it at all, shows this to be "for every man," for "the whole world;"—see John iii. 16—20; Heb. ii. 9; 1 John ii. 1, 2—yea, even for his enemies, ungodly, and for those that perish eternally.—See Rom. xiv. 15, and 2 Pet. ii. 1—3. These passages sufficiently prove that Christ has died even for those that "perish," and consequently for all men without exception. And how can it be otherwise, since there never was, nor never will be but one indivisible human nature? The entire of that nature has offended, and has thereby become guilty, polluted, and depraved. That nature was entirely, its sin excepted, taken up in the person and constitution of our Redeemer, the great representative of the human family, in which nature the atonement was made, presented, and accepted; and to take up the nature of all, and only die for a few, is plainly a contradiction; besides, the atonement is the grand basis *of all* his mediatorial work. In the possession and execution of this we see him acting as Priest, Prophet, and King. The atonement alone has given him jurisdiction in the case of every one of the human family. On the scheme of limited atonement he cannot be *king* over the reprobates; for this simple but irrefragable reason, because he never died for them, and, if so, he has no authority to bring *them* to judgment, consequently *they* cannot be condemned and punished, for no one has a right to judge and punish save Jesus Christ himself. Hear his own statements on this head:—"For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." Again, "All power is given unto *me*," says Christ, "in heaven and in earth." Now let us ask, how is this power which is, doubtless, mediatorial and kingly, delegated to Christ? The answer is, because he died to acquire it.—See Phil. ii. 5—11. All this power therefore flows to him, and rests in him, from his atonement. Let us again bear in mind, and distinctly understand, in connection with this, that those that are in hell are said to suffer under THE WRATH OF THE LAMB. They were sent there *by him*, as *his* "enemies, that would not have *him* to reign over them." And this will be the case with all his enemies. Those who so strenuously contend for limited atonement and particular redemption would do well to grapple with this subject, presented in this light, which is the only way in which it should be grappled with, and give us fairly and honestly the result of their deliberations. As for us, we are fixed in our belief of universal redemption, and that because there is not one passage in the Bible *against* it, and such abundance for

it. We therefore honestly avow our belief of the doctrine; and as it really destroys the doctrine of the "horrid decrees," we therefore reject them, and shall continue to cling to the other.

5. We reject the doctrine of the "horrid decrees," because it is at variance with the original and still unrepealed commission given by Christ to the ministers of the gospel. "Go to all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." This corresponds, squares, and quadrates with God's universal love, with the atonement of Christ, with the operations of the Spirit of God, and with the injunctions of the Word of God. All these are as free as the air we breathe, and as general as the circumambulated atmosphere of heaven which surrounds and fills the entire universe. The commission, you perceive, is a *general* one, "go into *all the world* and preach the *gospel*," *i. e.* the glad news of salvation, "TO EVERY CREATURE."—See also Luke xxiv. 45—48. This is the command given by the Great Head of the Church, and stands now, and ever will, in its extensive and universal purport, and will always be binding on all the true and faithful ambassadors of Christ. Our respected brethren on the opposite say, "we can consistently with our views of personal election and reprobation, and do, offer salvation to every man." I know you do, for I have myself heard you do so again and again, and that with great earnestness, eloquence, and zeal. And your practice is in perfect keeping with your preaching of this doctrine; for you build churches, support missions at home and abroad, build and support schools for children, and your assiduity and diligence in your pastoral visitations are all admirable, and highly praiseworthy, and at once and clearly show that your objects are not the here and there one, but the whole of mankind. You labour and labour hard to save all, and I believe you would not pass by one. Your object, and may God grant it you, is to raise mankind *en masse* out of the ruins of the fall, and present it *en masse* as a chaste and spotless virgin to Christ. And yet all the while you believe that God has made no provision for the salvation of the greatest number of mankind! What a lamentable inconsistency there is between your creed and your practice! Of all the inconsistencies in the world, this certainly is the greatest; but it has this redeeming quality, it is not only an *innocent* but a *happy* one. We must, however, in this place stop to settle a few questions with you on the subject of your universal offers of mercy. Why do you offer salvation to all, when at the same time you believe that God has passed an irrevocable decree of reprobation on the greatest number of mankind? Your answer is, "we do not know who the elect

are;" that is, you cannot distinguish them from the reprobate when both *en masse* form your congregations. Therefore, brethren, *ignorance* forms the basis of your gospel ministrations! This is a sad case truly. But, brethren, bear with us, we have another question to ask you, by whom are ye commissioned to preach the gospel? Your answer, no doubt, will be, "by the Holy Ghost." Very well; does not the Holy Ghost possess the power of discrimination? does he not know the elect from the reprobate? Granting that it is all random work with you, certainly the Holy Ghost that "knoweth all things; searcheth all things; yea, even the deep things of God," cannot be subject to this defect. The idea is revolting. If the attribute of Omniscience is conceded to the Holy Ghost, and in justice to our Calvinistic brethren we do say that it is so conceded, therefore he must have known from eternity who the elect and reprobates were and are to be. This point established; then we ask, what is to become of the *sincerity* of the Holy Ghost? who gives men a *general* commission to "preach the gospel to every creature," when he himself has determined never to make the callings of the gospel, urged by his divinely commissioned servants, effectual to the greatest part of the human family? Calling and inviting *all*, and at the same time "passing by the greatest part of the human race," is a mode of procedure, to say the least of it, is not very intelligible; besides it is an awful reflection on the omniscience and sincerity of the third person in the ever-blessed Trinity! Now, to illustrate great things by small, what would you think of a nobleman in your neighbourhood, on a certain day, making a feast to a select few; and issuing out a *general* invitation, urging every man in the neighbourhood to come; yea, telling his messengers to "compel them to come" and partake of his bounties, assuring them that the provisions are as abundant as the invitation is general and pressing; that a most hearty, cordial, and welcome reception will be given to all, for he is no respecter of persons; yea, you are also further told that a refusal will not only offend him but incur his hottest displeasure. I ask you, what construction would you put upon a message thus delivered to you? The day appointed dawns; with a glad and highly elated heart ye repair to the mansion, having never for a moment questioned the sincerity of the servants who invited you, much less that of the benevolent nobleman's himself. To the place you all go; but, to your great astonishment, you are then and there told, that the nobleman only intended from the beginning to entertain a select few. The selection is accordingly made. The few go in, and all the rest of you are shut out; and

that for no previous offence committed against him, nor for anything else on your part either implied or expressed, but just to show his sovereign power to do what he liked with his own. Home, however, you come, disappointed and vexed, not that he entertained the few, this you knew he had a right to do if he chose; and you never for a moment questioned it, but that he called and urged you to come, promising you a share of his bounties, and threatening you with severe vengeance in the event of not complying with his request, and yet all the time never intending you either to come or to partake. This is the alone ground of your complaint. Hence your cutting questions, severe remarks, loud murmurs, and severe criticisms on this unheard-of and unparalleled conduct; in short, you call in question the right that such a double-faced hypocrite has to the name which he bears; and all right-minded and rational men would coincide with you in all your animadversions on such a deceitful conduct! Now, my brethren, if this conduct is really beneath the dignity of a mortal man to evince towards his fellow mortals, can we, dare we, impute such to God? And yet this is the genuine imputation of Calvinism to the Holy Ghost, by whom they are commissioned to "go and preach the gospel to every creature," consequently, because the doctrine of the "decrees," as held and explained by our Calvinistic brethren, leads into such horrid conclusions, and reflect so seriously and awfully on the sincerity and truth of the Holy Ghost, we must and do reject it.

6. We must depart from this doctrine, because it is sadly and perniciously at variance with the universal offers of mercy made by the gospel to all and every sinner. When we open the Sacred Volume and begin to read with any degree of attention, we soon find that its mercies are free for all; and, as it has been already explained, the commission embodies the whole world as its circuit, and every rational creature as its object. The system of boundless mercy does not rest in *generals*, but most minutely descends into *particulars*. The "lanes, highways," and even the "hedges," are pointed out; and the "lame, the maimed, the halt, and the blind," are set before us, together with the "poor," as objects to be "invited," and even "compelled to come in." The "top of high places—by the way in the places of the paths—at the gates —at the entry of the city—and at the coming in at the doors"—everywhere the minister is to go. Wherever a human soul exists, there the message of offered mercy is to be sent, as you may more fully perceive by consulting the following passages of inspired truth:—See Prov. i. 20—23, and viii. 1—10; Isa. lv. 1—7; Luke

xiv. 15—24; Rev. xxii. 17. And now, why all this if God has destined to close his mercy, or rather to have never displayed it to the greatest part of the human family? if "all the rest of mankind have been passed by and foreordained to wrath?" why such care, solicitude, and anxiety in inviting *them* to partake of salvation? There is really so much stupid nonsense in the very idea, and it is withal so contrary to the uniform tenor of the Word of God, which evidently does not pass by one within its gracious sound, that we feel in duty bound to cast the "horrible decrees" aside as the production of erring mortals, and gladly and thankfully receive the Word of God in their room and stead.

7. We reject the doctrine, because it contradicts the injunctions laid "upon all men to repent and believe." Why, this we ask, if God has determined unalterably to damn a certain portion of the human family, why is this unfortunate portion called upon to repent and believe in Christ for the salvation of their souls? when, in truth, he is no Saviour to them, never was, nor never will be, if the doctrine of absolute reprobation be true. It is as clear as the sun is seen by its own light, that salvation from sin in this world, and an entrance into glory, are inseparably attached to penitence and faith in Christ. Why, we ask again, should these be laid as duties to be discharged by the reprobates? what if any of *them* were to comply, repent, and believe? "for where the king's commandment is there is power;" a power to enforce, and a power to obey; what would be the consequence? would he not be entitled to salvation? the very thing promised, not as a matter of right or merit, we grant, but as a privilege of mercy to which he is graciously entitled by the pledged promise and solemn oath of the God of truth. Imagine the scene. Here is one claiming salvation on the pledged promises of God; he comes up to the requirements of God's word, in order to salvation; he is a *sinner*, a penitent and believing sinner. What is now to be done? salvation cannot be obtained; why? because he was reprobated in the counsels of eternity ages many before he was born. This is the legitimate reason—nothing else. There, however, the sinner stands, expecting, on the solemn pledges of the Almighty's word, to be pardoned. Don't be frightened, nor think me insane. God, in this case, is driven to a dilemma! either the decree of reprobation must now be broken!! or all the eternal attributes of Jehovah, and all the truths of the gospel, eternally tarnished!!! It is no answer to this question to say, "that a case of this kind can never occur, because no reprobate can possibly repent and believe." Why is he commanded by the authority of God himself

to do so? Because of these terrible conclusions, and many other frightful tendencies of this system, we turn from it to the pure and salutary streams of God's Holy Word.

8. We depart from this system, because it is at variance with the specified cause of men's damnation. This is never represented in Scripture to be owing to any act of God's, done in the counsels of eternity, as reprobation in the Calvinistic sense is; nor to any exclusive principle in the atonement of Christ, nor to any inadequacy or inefficiency in the operations of the Holy Ghost, nor yet to any defect in the calls of the gospel, but purely, solely, and exclusively to a state of wilful impenitence on the part of the sinner himself—to a "loving of darkness rather than the light"—to a wilful and obstinate rejection of Christ as a Saviour, &c. &c.—as you may learn from the following passages, with many more that might be quoted in this place, from the Word of God:—See Prov. i. 24—33; John iii. 19; Luke xix. 11—27, and xiii. 34, 35. Read these carefully, and you will see thereby that every sinner might have been saved had they done what God had put in their power to do. Their not doing what they might have done, and doing those things which they might have avoided, will alone constitute men's final damnation, and not anything in God necessitating them to final and inevitable wo, as the doctrine of the decrees openly teaches us to believe.

9. And lastly, we for ever reject this scheme of Calvinistic election and reprobation, because it is at variance with the idea of a day of final judgment, and the impartial conduct of the Judge at that day. On the hypothesis already explained, and, we trust, reasonably and scripturally refuted, we can see no manner of reason for a day of judgment at all; for all the destinies of men and angels on this scheme were settled and fixed in the counsels of eternity; and the day of judgment surely will not alter in the least anything that was done there. "Everything comes to pass," we are told, "according to the foreordination of God;" and why a day of judgment to do the thing that has been already done? On the other hand, that is, on the scriptural scheme, this day is highly necessary; for here there is evidently an unequal distribution of rewards and punishments; and this is not only a presumptive proof of the certainty of that tremendous day, but is a reason why it should dawn. Here, every man has a day of grace, or a day of trial. There he will be "judged according to what he *has done*." "By thy words" there "thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." In conclusion, and by way of a general view of this doctrine, in its character and consequences, let it be observed that

it represents our blessed Lord, "Jesus Christ the righteous," "the only begotten Son of the Father, full of truth and grace," as an hypocrite, a deceiver of the people, a man void of common sincerity; for it cannot be denied, that he everywhere speaks as if he was willing that all men should be saved. Therefore, to say he was not willing that all men should be saved, is to represent him as a mere hypocrite and a dissembler. It cannot be denied that the gracious words which came out of his mouth are full of invitations to all sinners. To say, then, he did not intend to save all sinners, is to represent him as a gross deceiver of the people. It cannot be denied that he says, "come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy leaden." If, then, you say he calls those that cannot come —those whom he knows to be unable to come—those whom he can make able to come, but will not—how is it possible to describe greater insincerity? You represent him as mocking his helpless creatures, by offering what he never intends to give. You describe him as saying one thing and meaning another; as pretending the love which he had not. Him, in "whose mouth was no guile," you make full of deceit, void of common sincerity;—then, especially, when drawing near the city, he wept over it, and said, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often *would* I have gathered thy children together, and *ye would not.*" Now, if you say *they* would, but *he would not*, you represent him as weeping crocodiles' tears; weeping over the prey which himself had doomed to destruction. Such blasphemy this, as one would think might make the ears of a Christian tingle! But there is yet more behind; for such as it honours the Son, so doth this doctrine honour the Father. It destroys all his attributes at once—it overturns both his justice, mercy, and truth; yea, it represents the most Holy God as worse than the Devil, as both more false, more cruel, and more unjust: more *false*, because the Devil, liar as he is, hath never said, "he willeth all men to be saved;" more *unjust*, because the Devil cannot, if he would, be guilty of such injustice as you ascribe to God, when you say that God condemned millions of souls to everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels, for continuing in sin, which, for want of that grace *he will not* give them, they cannot avoid; and more *cruel*, because that unhappy Spirit "seeketh rest and findeth none," so that his own restless misery is a kind of temptation to him to tempt others. But God resteth in his high and holy place, so that to suppose him, of his own mere motion, of his pure will and pleasure, happy as he is, to doom his creatures, whether they will

or no, to endless misery, is to impute such cruelty to him as we cannot impute even to the great enemy of God and man. It is to represent the most high God—he that hath ears to hear let him hear—as more cruel, false, and unjust than the Devil! This is the blasphemy clearly contained in the "horrible decree" of predestination! And here I fix my foot. On this I join issue with every asserter of it. You represent God as worse than the Devil; more false, more cruel, more unjust. But you say you will prove it by Scripture. Hold! what will you prove by Scripture? that God is worse than the Devil? It cannot be. Whatever that Scripture proves, it never can prove this—whatever its true meaning be, this cannot be its true meaning. Do you ask, "what is its true meaning, then?" If I say, "I know not," you have gained nothing; for there are many Scriptures the true sense whereof neither you nor I shall know till death is swallowed up in victory! But this I know, better it were to say it had no sense at all, than to say it had such sense as this. It cannot mean, whatever it may mean besides, that the God of truth is a liar. Let it mean what it will, it cannot mean that the Judge of all the earth is unjust. No Scripture can mean that God is not love, or that his mercy is not over all his works; that is, whatever it prove beside, no Scripture can prove predestination. This is the blasphemy for which, however I love the persons who assert it, I abhor the doctrine of predestination—a doctrine, upon the supposition of which, if one could possibly suppose it for a moment, call it election, reprobation, or whatever you please, for all comes to the same thing, one might say to our adversary, the Devil, "thou fool, why dost thou roar about any longer? Thy lying in wait for souls is as needless and useless as our preaching. Hearest thou not, that God hath taken thy work out of thy hands; and that he doeth it much more effectually? Thou, with all thy principalities and powers, canst only so assault that we may resist thee; but he can irresistibly destroy both body and soul in hell! Thou canst only entice; but his unchangeable decree, to leave thousands of souls in death, compels them to continue in sin till they drop into everlasting burnings. Thou temptest; he forceth us to be damned; for we cannot resist his will. Thou fool, why goest thou about any longer seeking whom thou mayest devour? Hearest thou not that God is the devouring lion, the destroyer of souls, the murderer of men? Moloch caused only children to pass through the fire; and that fire was soon quenched; or, the corruptible body being consumed, its torment was at an end: but God, thou art told, by his eternal decree, fixed

before they had done good or evil, causes not only children of a span long, but the parents also, to pass through the fire of hell—the 'fire that shall never be quenched,' and the body which is cast thereinto being now incorruptible and immortal, will ever be consuming and never consumed, but 'the smoke of their torment,' because it is God's good pleasure, 'ascendeth up for ever and ever.'" "O how would the enemy of God and man rejoice to hear these things were so!—how would he cry aloud and spare not!—how would he lift up his voice and say, 'to your tents, O Israel! flee from the face of this God, or ye shall utterly perish!' But whither will ye flee? Into heaven? he is there; down to hell? he is there also: ye cannot flee from an Omnipresent Almighty Tyrant. And whether ye flee or stay, I call heaven his throne, and earth his footstool, to witness against you: ye shall perish, ye shall die eternally. Sing, O hell, and rejoice ye that are under the earth! for God, even the mighty God, hath spoken, and devoted to death thousands of souls, from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof! Here, O death, is thy sting! They shall not, cannot escape; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. Here, O grave, is thy victory! Nations yet unborn, or ever they have done good or evil, are doomed never to see the light of life, but thou shalt gnaw upon them for ever and ever! Let those morning stars sing together, who fell with Lucifer, son of the morning!—let all the sons of hell shout for joy! for the decree is past, and who shall disannul it?" Yea, the decree is past; and so it was before the foundation of the world. But what decree? even this, "I will set before the sons of men 'life and death, blessing and cursing,' and the soul that chooseth life shall live, as the soul that chooseth death shall die." This decree, whereby "whom God did foreknow, he did predistinate," was indeed from everlasting; this, whereby all who suffer Christ to make them alive, are "elect according to the foreknowledge of God," now standeth fast, even as the moon, and as the faithful witnesses in heaven; and when heaven and earth shall pass away, yet this shall not pass away; for it is as unchangeable and eternal as is the being of God—that God that gave it. This decree yields the strongest encouragement to abound in all good works, and in all holiness; and it is a well-spring of joy, of happiness also, to our great and endless comfort. This is worthy of God—it is every way consistent with all the perfections of his nature—it gives us the noblest view both of his justice, mercy, and truth. To this agrees the whole scope of the Christian revelation, as well as all the parts thereof—to this Moses and all the Prophets bear witness, and

our blessed Lord and all his Apostles. Thus Moses, in the name of his Lord: "I call heaven and earth to record against you this day, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that thou and thy seed may live." Thus Ezekiel, to cite one Prophet for all: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father. The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him."—Chap. xviii. 20. Thus our blessed Lord: "If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink."—John vii. 37. Thus his great Apostle St. Paul, Acts xvii. 30: "God commandeth all men everywhere to repent;"—"all men everywhere;" every man in every place, without any exception either of place or person. Thus St. James: "If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth liberally and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him."—James i. 5. Thus St. Peter: "The Lord is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."—2 Peter iii. 9. And thus St. John: "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but for the sins of *the whole world.*"—1 John ii. 1, 2. Hear ye this, therefore, ye that forget God! ye cannot charge your death upon him! "Have I any pleasure at all, that the wicked should die, saith the Lord?"—Ezek. xviii. 23, &c. "Repent, and turn from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin. Cast away from you all your transgressions whereby ye have transgressed, for why will ye die, O house of Israel? for I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God. Wherefore turn yourselves and live ye." "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked. Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?"—Ezek. xxxiii. 11. With confidence, and with the greatest consistency, we can, on our hypothesis, exhibit before you, my friends, an all-sufficient Saviour, ready and willing to save to the uttermost every one of you: assured you may now be, that whatever your sins and transgressions are, and no doubt they are many and great, they may all be pardoned. He waiteth to be gracious to you all—he gives you time for repentance, that ye may turn and live—he will in no wise cast away the sinner that comes to him humbled under a deep sense of his sins, but will extend to you all his salvation. Come, therefore, to him just as you are, only penitent and believing—come all, and come *now*, and you will find forgiveness of all your sins; he will receive you graciously, and love you

freely. None will be saved but those who will comply with the terms of salvation, and none will be damned but those who will criminally refuse.

"To none will he his grace deny—
Why will you perish, sinners, why?"

THE END.

MUIR, GOWANS, & CO. PRINTERS.

THE

BIBLE AND COMMON SENSE

AGAINST

CALVINISTIC ERROR:

A REVIEW

OF

MR. JAMES HOUSTON'S PAMPHLET,

ON

ETERNAL UNCONDITIONAL ELECTION.

BY GEORGE CRON,

(Of the Evangelical Union.)

"Give diligence to make your Calling and Election sure; for, if ye *do these things*, ye shall never fall."—2 Peter, i. 10.

BELFAST:

GEORGE PHILLIPS & SON, BRIDGE-STREET.

LANG, ADAMSON, & CO., GLASGOW.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

PREFACE.

It is necessary to inform the public that I have been engaged, on the Monday evenings, in the Wellington-Hall, Belfast, delivering a Course of Lectures, on the various points of difference between the "Evangelical Union" and denominations holding Calvinistic tenets.

That these Lectures were called for, the oft-recurring mistakes of objectors, and the misrepresentations that are abroad, abundantly show.

Mr. James Houston has thought fit to publish a pamphlet on one of the subjects brought forward, in which it is his aim to repel my fourteen objections against Eternal, Unconditional Election, but not the *reasonings* by which I established my propositions. That pamphlet I have briefly reviewed, because his pen is wielded in behalf of the Confession (the symbolical book of the Irish Presbyterian Church), for of Mr. H. I have no personal acquaintance.

I may apprize the reader that, after the delivery of the Lectures, "equal time" was given to the Lecturer and the Lecturer's opponents. When I came here, I found certain *arrangements* made; and with these arrangements, I have been told, Mr. H. expressed his concurrence. No undue advantage was thus taken. It was never anticipated that inquirers would expand so rapidly into disputants.

GEORGE CRON.

Belfast, *January* 3, 1855.

THE BIBLE AND COMMON SENSE

AGAINST

CALVINISTIC ERROR.

When the Author of the "Refutation, &c.," was, night after night, opposing my Lectures on Election, as set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith, I was under the impression that his remarks were unpremeditated. Judge, then, of my surprise at his recent publication. Instead of *new* matter, we have the speeches *verbatim*, or nearly so, which he orally delivered in the Wellington-Hall. It would seem, that far from not having sufficient time (as he complains), it was beautifully measured out for him. If evidence is demanded, I refer to his pamphlet. In these circumstances, might I not content myself with allowing the *printed* "effort" to pass unnoticed; especially as I endeavoured to answer, on the spot, what he, as a *speaker*, advanced against me, each successive Monday evening. Lest, however, the interests of souls and truth should be injured by my silence, I have deemed it proper to offer a few strictures upon it. I shall study condensation as much as possible, for this, among other reasons, that my combatant has digressed so astonishingly.

Before I enter on the consideration of J. H.'s Replies to my Fourteen Objections, I have, reluctantly, to prefer against him two charges:—

First.—The charge of *misrepresentation.* Since he was in danger of not taking down my objections correctly, he might, at least, have solicited a *copy* of them from me. Surely, this step should have preceded *attempted exposure.*

Secondly.—The charge of *defective statement of the truth.* He omits to mention, that I set aside the *nominal* distinction between Election as *unconditional*, and reprobation as *conditional.* The query was urged—Why are not both of them either unconditional or conditional? I alluded to the fact, that, in the case of *infants*, it must be *unconditional;* the elect infants being incapable of faith, and the non-elect incapable of unbelief. I pronounced the phrase "for their sin," utterly useless; inasmuch as the "sin" was *unavoidable* sin, being *foreordained* sin. I am unwilling to think that he designed not to tell the "whole truth."

At page 21, we are informed that the Confession of Faith is "much abused." We wonder if it occurred to J. H. that he is

implicated in the business. Though that standard unqualifiedly declares that Election is unconditional, "without any foresight of faith, or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing *in the creature, as conditions* or causes moving him thereunto" (chap. iii.), he, in the foot-note to page 3, makes an announcement, but not critically, to the effect, that it *does* depend on conditions *wrought out by God.* He will not admit that the will of man has anything whatever to do with these conditions; but he affirms, that there *are* conditions with which the Divine Will alone has to do—*i.e.*, that it is *conditional.* He thus wages war with the Confession, by advocating what it recognises not. If J. H. calculated that the foot-note, which meets us at the threshold, had softened the justly offensive epithet "unconditional," it is a *mis*-calculation. For does he not, by claiming for the rebel machine-like passivity, hinge election, from Alpha to Omega, upon the will of God? He does; and what is that but *Unconditional Election?* I refuse to put a higher value upon it.

We come now to the Replies, which we hope briefly to dispose of in their order.

Objection I.—Unconditional election is contrary to our natural ideas of an infinitely intelligent and good Being. On this objection, Mr. H. remarks—"It cannot be said, that whatever is contrary to our ideas of an infinitely perfect, good, and intelligent Being, is false. I will prove this negation. It will be granted that God is omnipotent—that he has power to do everything, except sin. It will, also, be admitted, that He is infinitely holy—that He hates sin with a perfect hatred. Now, sin exists, and mars his fairest works. God has power to destroy sin in a second of time. Does he do so? No. Is that not contrary to our ideas of an infinitely good Being, who is omnipotent? Most certainly it is" (pp. 3 and 4). On J. H.'s reply, observe:—

1. It is not denied that we possess natural ideas of God.

2. It is not shown, that Unconditional Election (involving Unconditional Reprobation) is not contrary to those ideas. It "could be easily proved," but it is not. Though this was the proper work, it has been coolly avoided.

3. There is substituted for it an attack upon one of the premises of my argument, viz.:—That "whatever is contrary to our natural ideas of an infinitely intelligent and good Being, is false." I laid it down, as a *first principle*—and I lay it down as a first principle—to which no reflecting person can demur. The *existence of sin* is not an exception. The reference to it is "subtle, but not ingenious." For (1.) there is no parallel between it and Unconditional Election. Sin is the act of a creature; while Election is the act of God? (2.) Since sin is not caused by God, it is not irreconcileable with our ideas of him as the perfect One. He endowed man with a self-deter-

mining power of will. Is that contrary to our natural ideas of infinite intelligence? When man disobeyed, God placed him under a remedial scheme. Is that contrary to our natural ideas of infinite goodness? All the dealings of Jehovah with our race, before and after the Fall, have been, and will be, consistent with his attributes, and will appear consistent to every soul, bearing in mind that men are sinners, and in a state of probation. The question, triumphantly and repeatedly put, why is not sin destroyed by the "fiat of Omnipotence?" is pointless. For the Lord reigneth, as moral governor, and the destruction of sin, in the way indicated, would be equivalent to the annihilation of the perpetrators of it.

4. The premises intact, the conclusion is legitimate. Who is not familiar with the argument for a future judgment, derived from the past and present moral state of mankind? Wherein lies its force? In the obvious disagreement between that state and our natural ideas of Divine justice. J. H. plays nicely into the hands of Infidels. Unconditional Election, likewise, clashes with our natural ideas of an infinitely intelligent, just, and good God; and, therefore, its falsity is a fair inference.

Objection II., as I worded it, ran thus:—"Unconditional Election is contrary to the primary signification and application of the terms 'Elect and Election.'" To invalidate this objection, Mr. H. submits two reasons, why it should not be entertained:—

1. "Many words, when applied to the Divine Being, are not used in their primary import. The meaning is not even secondary in the common sense, but often remarkably peculiar. A few instances may be given. 'Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated' (Rom. ix., 13.) Now, did God hate Esau? Not at all. The meaning of the word 'hate' is said to be loved less, which could be easily proved, by a careful comparison of the texts in which the word occurs, so that the sense is, God loved Jacob more than he loved Esau. Now, we see, the meaning and application would mislead us in the exegesis of this Scripture. Again, 'God rested from his works,'" &c. (p. 5.)

2d. "Because election, on account of human merit, implies salvation by works, and contradicts the plain declarations of Scripture—'By the deeds of the law shall no flesh living be justified.'" (p. 6.)

On J. H.'s reply, observe—

1. He errs in fastening upon the verb "to elect." I advanced nothing about the verb whatever. He errs, moreover, in classing it with such verbs as "to rest," and "to repent." Human election is the act of choosing, or process of separation. Divine election is the act of choosing, or process of separation.

2. The first meaning of the *adjective*, rendered "elect," or "chosen," is, according to a high authority, Professor Robinson, "select, choice, excellent."

3. The application of "elect" conveys the same idea. E.g., 1st Peter ii. 6—"Wherefore, also, it is contained in Scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect," &c. Now, why was Christ the "chosen of God"? Was it not on account of his transcendant moral worth? Acts xv. 25, "Then pleased it the Apostles and Elders, with the whole Church, to send *chosen* men," &c. Can there be any doubt that Barsabas and Silas were the most suitable to be sent with Paul? If there is, the 22d and 26th verses will remove it. "Chief (or leading) men among the brethren." "Men that have hazarded their lives for the name of the Lord Jesus Christ." See, also, 1 Tim., v. 2, and Acts ix. 15.

4. The digression about salvation not being by *works*, is irrelevant as it is wearisome. All acquainted with our theology know that grace is the "beginning, middle, and end," of our system. "Salvation by God's free and unmerited grace is the watchword of Morisonians." J. H. imagines, if the sinner supply the appointed condition, he does "a part, and, of course, deserves a part of the praise" (p. 6). Accordingly, he runs foul of the "lively oracles," by wholly discarding concurrent human agency.* Is faith, *in no sense*, the Christian's? Are good works performed subsequent to believing, *in no sense* the Christian's? The activity of man is not, and cannot be, dispensed with. The Gospel must be received, but its voluntary reception is *compatible* with grace. Hear the testimony of Paul—Rom. iii. 27, "Where is boasting, then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? nay; but by the *law of faith*." Does the appropriation of a gift interfere with the favour, of which it is the embodiment? No. Neither does the appropriation of "eternal life" interfere with the favour of which it is the embodiment. Election is of grace, and not the less that it is conditional. It is of faith, that it *might be* by grace. Believers, in contradistinction to unbelievers, are the parties chosen. Hence we preserve the primary signification and application of the adjective "elect." "Salvation is all of grace; yet it is proffered on certain *irreversible conditions*. Those who accept or reject these conditions, present reasons intrinsic in their character, why they should, or should not, become 'heirs of the grace of life.' *Such reasons do not imply, that those who are saved receive eternal life on the ground of merit in themselves, and not wholly as a gift of Jesus.*" †

J. H. continues:—"What was the character of the parties chosen? Abraham was an idolater when God called him, and promised to make his seed a blessing to the world. Jeremiah was sanctified and ordained a prophet before he was born.—Jer. i. 5. How could he, at that time, fulfil any conditions? John was the recipient of saving blessings before he was conscious of his responsibility. 'He was filled with the Holy

* See Professor Guthrie's Lecture on the "Work of the Spirit," p. 2.
† President Mahan, on Rom. IX. Lec. v. p. 131.

Ghost from his mother's womb.' What were the Apostles? Illiterate fishermen — despised tax-gatherers — tent-makers. When Paul was chosen to the Apostleship, he was a persecutor. . . . . In Old Testament times, God's agents were all appointed in a special manner. Not, assuredly, on account of intrinsic merit, but by reason of the qualifications by which they were miraculously endowed by the Holy Ghost. The Spirit of the Lord, it is said, came upon Saul, David, Sampson, &c.'" (P. 7.)

Not to be over-minute, we answer (1.) No Prophet had a claim to the prophetic office, and no Apostle had a claim to the Apostolic office. (2.) It cannot be proved that the "holy men," "who spake as they were moved," were not the most fitting instruments for the revelation of the Divine mind; and never till it is proved, have Calvinists anything to utter on that score worthy of attention. (3.) The appointment of Prophets and Apostles had relation to the spiritual well-being of the *entire* posterity of Adam.

(4.) In the choice of them, we may rely upon it, God did not overlook the qualifications, inherent and circumstantial, that might belong to them; e.g. Paul, who is designated a "Vessel of Election," after his conversion. His instruments were all right instruments; and, besides, the Lord, in the selection of them, was not conducting toward them as moral agents. A Prophet might be a Prophet, and yet perish. Witness Balaam.*

Objection III., as worded by me, ran thus:—"When God makes the eternal separation between the righteous and unrighteous, he always assigns reasons, intrinsic in the character, as the *sole grounds* of that separation."

The writer of the refutation, by altering it to "Unconditional Election cannot be true, because, at the last day, every man will be judged according to his works," (p. 8) steers clear of the difficulty. J. H. adds:—"The question here to be determined is—does Unconditional Election involve Calvinists in a denial of the truths connected with the final judgment. If the question be asked, every Calvinist will reply that he firmly believes them" (p. 8). I referred to Rom. ii. 6; John v. 29; Mat. xxv. 31—46. The "for" is emphatic. "Come ye blessed of my Father—*for* I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat." "Depart, ye cursed—*for* I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat." These things (the evidences of their perseverance in the faith) are the conditions (not the ground) by virtue of which they "inherit the Kingdom." The absence of them (the evidence of unbelief) explains the "Depart ye cursed." But, on the hypothesis of Unconditional Election is the "picture" by St. Matthew, the *philosophy* of the proceedings of the last day.

* For an exposition of the passages cited by J. H., see Morison on Romans IX. "Bible Election," by the Rev. F. Ferguson, Glasgow. "Bible Answers," by the Rev. John Kirk, Edinburgh, chap. XII.

Does it not involve a denial of one of the "truths connected with the final judgment?" Can our assailants return an honest affirmative? No. They resolve it into the sovereign and inscrutable will of God. He was not influenced in the smallest by any condition of the sinner. The results are to be accounted for by the "mere good pleasure" of the Most High. Had the Creator set his love upon the reprobate, they would have acted in every respect, as the Elect; so that the true reason of their rejection must be sought in the mind of God. I postpone my thoughts, meanwhile, on the condemnation of the non-Elect "for their own wilful sins." Calvinists have defended Unconditional Reprobation as well as Unconditional Election.* Has J. H. forgot Rom. ix. 18—"Therefore hath He mercy on whom He will, and whom He will He hardeneth."

Objection IV.—Unconditional Election charges God with partiality. To this, it is replied, by J. H.—"The unequal distribution of God's favours does not afford sufficient grounds for the charge of partiality. We see only a part, God sees the whole. What appears partial to us, may be most impartial with respect to him. We do not say that God is partial, because one man is strong and another weak; because one man is poor and another rich; because one man is miserable and another comparatively happy. . . . . There is great dissimilarity in the character and condition of men and nations. The Jews were in possession of Theocatic and Messianic privileges. They were God's own peculiar people. They had more intercourse with Him than any of our race, and enjoyed the means of salvation in a much greater degree than any other people. Will Morisonians, with such facts before them, say that God is partial, and a respecter of persons?" (P. 10.)

On reply 4, observe:—

1.—A constitution implies variety. There is diversity in the circumstances of individuals. This we cheerfully grant. The privileges of one nation are superior to the privileges of another. This we cheerfully grant. J. H. traces it to "God's sovereign pleasure." Not so fast, friend. Has the *human will* no share in it? Yes, and an important share. When man was at the *direct* disposal of his Maker, he did not put Adam in a flowery, fragrant, fruitful garden, and Eve in a howling wilderness. Personal and national conduct always mightily affects the condition of the person and people. We concede it, God is not partial, because our situations are not exactly the same. Why? Because we shall we *judged according to our situations*. "To whom much is given, of them shall much be required." There is a change when we enter the *domain of moral government*. The Almighty, in the treatment of His subjects, must be guided by the eternal principle of rectitude.

* See Calvin's Institutes. Book iii.
"Universal Redemption," by the Rev. R. Watson. Sect. IV.

To respect persons (as is manifest from Acts x. 34) is to "accept or reject them without regard to their moral qualities" or the "merits of the case." If God were to confer upon the least righteous the richest rewards, and upon the most righteous the poorest rewards, he would be guilty of a violation of justice; it would be "respect of persons." Who will gainsay it? Morally contemplated, we cannot distinguish between the elect and the reprobate; yet, the "King of Kings" arbitrarily consigns, without the possibility of escape, millions of them to bottomless perdition, and predestinates the rest to unending felicity. Is that not the doing of partiality? Negative it, and illustrate. The parable of the labourers in the vineyard, to which Mr. H. betakes himself, is not apposite. He thus comments upon it—"They who had toiled longest complained, not that they had not got their dues, but that those who had not borne the heat of the day had got so much. Listen to Jesus' answer—it cuts away Mr. Cron's objection by the very roots—'Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil because I am good?'" (P. 10.) Suffice it, that in the parable is vindicated the *right* of God to send salvation to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews. When the light dawns upon them, in the depths of their spiritual darkness, unveiling the countenance of Deity, not gloomy and forbidding, but interested and radiant, the Israelites are not wronged. The Jews were not deprived of their boasted privileges by the extension of them; or, if so, were they not the occasion of their withdrawal. Neither did these privileges *necessitate* the justification and sanctification of either Jew or Gentile. They might be fearfully neglected and misimproved. It is a totally different thing to decree unconditionally a certain number to life and a certain number to death, and infallibly secure the accomplishment of these opposite ends by opposite means.

Objection V.—Unconditional Election is inconsistent with a state of probation.

In the section of J. H., under this objection, we have a rare conglomeration of absurdities and contradictions. It is sickening to peruse them. He commences his reply, by alleging, "It is argued here that the doctrine of Unconditional Election takes away man's liberty. Let us see if a decree in itself takes away liberty. What God does, he decrees; and what he decrees, he does. Morisonians admit this; it is a part of their creed. God made the world, he therefore decreed to make it. God saves every one who believes in Jesus; he, therefore, decreed to give salvation to every one who would believe. This is granted. Nay, more; He has promised to give salvation to any one who comes to Him in His own appointed way. He will keep His promise. . . . Who will say that he is not free, in the strictest sense? Hence a decree does not take away liberty. . . . Was He (Christ) under a decree? Yes.

Was He perfectly free? Most undoubtedly. Hence a decree does not take away freedom. . . . He was also in a state of probation. He was the second Adam. (Hebrews, ii., 14, 18.) Hence we infer that the decree of Unconditional Election is not inconsistent with free agency and responsibility. Is the Devil under a decree? He is a reprobate; God permits him to sin—he sins freely—he cannot possibly do anything but sin. He is unable to do good. Will God punish him for sinning? Of that there can be no doubt. From the case of the chief reprobate, we learn a decree does not destroy liberty and responsibility. . . . But it may be said that it is a contradiction to say, that he is under a decree, and free. May not the decree be in harmony with his own will, or the motives which influence it. Or, may not his own free choice run parallel with the decree, though recorded before he was born. . . . One limit, and one only, can be placed to God's power; and that is, that he cannot sin—a most honourable limit. The problem of God's existence baffles the puny faculties of man. Yet . . . he will tell you if he ordain at all, he must be guilty of sin. . . . The state of God's people is to be considered one of preparation rather than probation." (pp. 12, 13.)

On Reply 5, observe:—

1. It *was* not argued by me, that the decree "takes away man's liberty, and leaves him irresponsible." I maintained that unconditional Election was inconsistent with a state of probation, and I maintain so still. It is essential to a state of probation, in which, it is commonly believed, all men are, that the *position be such*, that we can either gain happiness or incur misery.* But is this the position of the Elect? Is this the position of the reprobate? Consult the Confession, chap. iii. "These angels and men thus predestinated and foreordained are *particularly and unchangeably* designed; and *their number* is so *definite and certain, that it cannot be either increased or diminished.*" Surely, if the Elect *cannot* perish, and the reprobate *cannot* be saved, there can be *no probationers*, and *no probation.*

2. That the decree does not take away the *liberty of the decreer*, is as palpable as day is not night. But it does obliterate the liberty of those toward whom the decree looks. Unchangeable foreordination of "whatsoever comes to pass," is synonymous with *necessity.* Events good, bad, and indifferent, past, present, and future, *cannot but be, and cannot be otherwise than they are and will be.* No decree *can* remain unfulfilled; and, if that is not chasing free agency from the earth and the universe, we are sadly deceived. Liberty is the ability either to do or not to do. If we are predestinated to do, do we *must.* If we are predestinated not to do, do we *cannot.* If there is an unconditional decree to save the Elect, saved they *must* be. If there is an unconditional decree to damn the reprobate, damned they *must* be. There is no alternative—no probation.

* See Bishop Butler's Analogy.

3. Christ was not "under a decree" in this world. His acts were all voluntary acts. Who is of opinion that the Saviour could not have performed one miracle more, or one miracle less? "I lay down my life for the sheep." "For the son of man is come to seek and to save that which is lost." Also Heb. x. 7. Strip not, we beseech you, the Son of God of the just praise which has been ascribed to him. Strip him not of the glorious rewards he merited by the sacrifice of himself, by the affirmation that all his thoughts, desires, words, and actions, were fated. Let him wear his crown unsullied, and wear it for ever. Neither is the "chief reprobate" under a decree, for "liberty is as inalienable as intelligence." If he were, could he be blamed for the happening of the thing decreed? No; "of that there can be no doubt." There is a finite moral certainty that he will never desist from rebellion, but no necessity—that is, his continuance in rebellion is not decreed. To say, "he (the Devil) sins freely," "he (the Devil) cannot possibly do anything but sin," is a bare-faced contradiction. As the decree forestalls Satan's (supposed) will, there can be no will. Must not the (supposed) will be in harmony with the decree? J. H. puts the first last, and the last first. Why the decree, if foreknown that Satan's "free choice" would run parallel with it? Must not the free (?) choice run parallel with the decree "recorded before he was born?" If God ordain moral evil, he must be guilty of sin. He who causes the sin is the author of it. The decree is causative, being a determination of the Omnipotent Eternal will. God cannot sin,* is one limit; and God cannot make it true, that I am, and that I am not, is a second limit. Poor man! will he never learn? will he never learn humility? That God's people are in a state of preparation, rather than probation, is gratuitous, in the face of an opposite general conviction.

Objection VI.—Unconditional Election limits the atonement. Picture out a little child, with a glass of water, approaching a volcano to extinguish it, and you have J. H. approaching Objection VI. It is a "wild concussion," and most damaging to the author of the Refutation. His bruises are so serious, he never again rallies. When he neared it, he would have acted wisely, had he acted on the principle of preterition. The reader will forbear with me, if I furnish him with specimens of J. H's. ratiocination—"The attempt to prove it (Universality of Atonement) is always frivolous and unsuccessful, based entirely on misconceptions of indefinite terms and notions, derogatory to the character of God, and the work of Christ. . . . . Neither the Scriptures nor Calvinists limit the sufficiency of the Atonement. . . . . We believe had the moon and her attendants—ten thousand stars . . . . . Had each of these been inhabited by a race of fallen beings, one drop of

* "Impossibility is a moral impossibility, and the use of the word here explains the sense in which the words 'impossible,' 'cannot,' &c., are often used in the Scriptures."—Rev. A. Barnes on Heb. vi. 18.

Christ's blood would be a sufficient and acceptable ransom, did an insulted Creator intend it to be so. . . . The advocates of unlimited atonement base their arguments on indefinite expressions, and words which appear to be general, when in reality they are particular. Synecdoche is a figure of speech of frequent occurrence in the inspired writings. Sometimes the whole is taken for a part, and the part for a whole. The words and phrases upon which the strongest reliance is placed are—world, the whole world, all and every man. To arrive at the true meaning of a word or phrase, the context must be considered, and the definite and undisputed signification which it has, where it occurs in other places. This is a fair principle. Applying it to the present case, let us endeavour to ascertain the true import of the words and phrases—"World," "whole world," "all," and "every man." "*All men* held John as a prophet." . . . "A decree went out from Cæsar Augustus, that *all the world* should be taxed" (Luke ii., 1.) "*All the world* wondered after the beast" (Rev. xiii., 3.) The above terms are used in a sense more or less restricted. All men did not hold John as a prophet. Did Augustus Cæsar tax the whole world? . . . . Those texts which appear to imply universal redemption, may, also, be explained in a similar manner. E.g., "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the Righteous, and He is the propitiaton for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." John preached and ministered to the Jews (Gal., ii., 9.) He, therefore, simply means, in the text quoted, that Jesus died not only for believing Jews, but for believing Gentiles—us meaning Jews; whole world signifying both Jews and Gentiles. His object was to remove the prejudice of his countrymen, and proclaim salvation to all *classes*, or *sorts*, or *kinds* of men: not all individuals. Let us look at another verse—"That He, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man" (Heb. ii., 9). With regard to this text, I say that Christ did taste death for every man. We believe that Christ tasted death for every man, in a particular sense. "We trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of those who believe" (1st John, iv., 10.) God's people are the salt of the earth; they, therefore, preserve the world from becoming corrupt. In this sense, Christ died for all. . . . It should be remembered that in the text, viz.: that He tasted death for every man, there is no word for "man" in the original. Every man in the very next verse is restricted to the "sons brought to glory" (pp. 13, 14, 15, 16).

On Reply 6, observe:—

1. My argument was this:—Whatever evidence there is in the Bible for Unlimited Atonement, militates against Unconditional Election. Of course, there was *none* presented! The labours of Truman, Wardlaw, Jenkyn, and Morison, our judicious

and modest critic characterises as "frivolous and unsuccessful." Do we violate the *Ninth* Commandment, when we characterise the attempt to *dis*prove it, "always frivolous and unsuccessful, based entirely on misconceptions of indefinite terms and notions, derogatory to the character of God and the work of Jesus."

2. That the *chant* on the "sufficiency" of the atonement, is with Limitarians a *sweet* but a *stolen* string. Atonement, with some of them (including J. H.), is a *commercial transaction. (Quid pro quo.)* How, then, "in the name of common sense," can it be sufficient for more than the number, for whose iniquities satisfaction was given? If I pay ten pounds for six people in debt, will that same ten pounds pay for fifty people in debt? Suppose the sum due to be five hundred sovereigns, and would the ten pounds clear the creditors, if I *intended* it to clear them?

The Saviour shed many drops of blood for the elect; so that his ransom to the Father was *over*-payment, for "one drop," if intended, is sufficient for the "moon and her attendants." Could the many drops cleanse a single sin of a single reprobate, even though God were to design it? Yes, on our theory of atonement, but not the Calvinistic. Some Calvinists being witnesses, had Jesus expiated the guilt of the "ordained" to "dishonour and wrath," his sufferings would have been inconceivably greater than they were. Away with this *flourish* about the "sufficiency," till their views on the nature of the great sacrifice are modified.

3. We pause shortly on the "indefinite terms" upon which we are said to build the doctrine that Christ died for the "ungodly." We shudder at J. H.'s mangling of Scripture. When he penned his 15th page, was he oblivious of the solemn truth that the eye of God was upon him? Did he examine his own heart? Ah, dear Sir, "Let God be true, and every man a liar!" We advise retractation. It is henceforth out of the question (if his principles of interpretation are to be adopted), to search the book for texts teaching that "all have sinned"—that it is appointed unto men to die—that prayer should be made for "all men"—that the "world" will be judged—that every man will be raised from the dust; for all may be "restricted," and "world," though "appearing general," is, "in reality, particular."

The truth is, those passages which are quoted by J. H. are exceptions to the rule, and are to be found in all languages. The context prevents deception; but what is there in the context of 1 Tim. ii., 1—6, to lead us to suppose that the "all" in the sixth verse is not universal, or in 2 Cor., v., 14?

Were I disposed, might I not, with these, and kindred passages for a foundation, demand of J. H. to explain the "all men held John as a Prophet" literally, &c.? On Luke ii., 1, and Rev. xiii., 3. (See the "Extent of the Propitiation," by Professor Morison, p. 52.)

Permit me an extract from Dr. Bonar's "Truth and Error,"

p. 94, (a Calvinistic Scotch author):—"I admit, there are difficulties with regard to some of the passages in which the Word *all* occurs. But I would rather confess the difficulty, and wait for further light, than at once proceed to do violence to the passage itself, or make its difficulty a reason for doing violence to others. I also admit that there are passages in which there can be no doubt as to the universality of the terms. These you will find enumerated by Dr. Candlish, to whose work I again refer you. Such passages," says he, "refer to the discovery which the work of Christ is fitted to make of the Divine character, and especially of the Divine compassion and benevolence, and are to be regarded as giving intimation of the widest possible universality. This is particularly the case in that most blessed statement, 'God so loved the world,' &c.; for we would be little disposed to qualify or explain away the term 'world,' as here employed. We would rather rejoice in this text, as asserting that the Gospel has a most gracious aspect to the world, or to mankind as such." (P. 26.)

Mr. H.'s exposition of 1st John ii., 2, is singularly unfortunate. The Epistle ranks among the "Catholic" epistles. With him, "our sins" is convertible with "believing Jews;" "whole world" with "believing Jews and Gentiles," and will stand thus:—"And He is the propitiation for believing Jews, and not only for believing Jews, but also for believing Jews and Gentiles!" Carrying out this analysis of "whole world," 1st John, v., 19, will read thus:—"We (believing Jews) know that we are of God, and the whole world (believing Jews and Gentiles) lieth in wickedness!" Alas! for the guardian of Belfast Orthodoxy. What an admirable commentator! J. H. is another "sagacious friend." I challenge all Calvinists (not some), in all countries (not some), to point out the verse, in which believers are designated by the term "world," or "whole world."

But the writer of the Refutation believes that Christ "tasted death for every man." Nay; don't be incredulous. He is backed by 1st Tim., iv., 10—"God who is the Saviour of all men" (an example of "Synecdoche"—the whole for a part.) He believes it in a "particular sense." Throughout he has been in "the seventh heaven of invention"—a "particular sense!"—in the sense, that the Elect "preserve the world from becoming corrupt." It speaks for itself. Why, since the Elect live "more and more unto righteousness," do they not preserve the world for *aye?*

The death of Jesus was an atonement for sin; and if He did not atone for the transgressions of the non-elect, he did not die for them. To say He did, is a gross misapplication of words. Did J. H. get this idea from the Spirit, or is it original? As there is no Greek for "man" in Heb., ii., 9, he wonders, may it not be "every son brought to glory." No; because the tenth

verse is after the ninth. Compare Heb., ii., 9 with Heb., xii., 14, and 1st Thess., v., 14 and 15.

The considerations to be "well-weighed" (see p. 16), may be obviated in a sentence or two. It is remarkable, it is invariably "he that believeth shall be saved," not "he for whom Christ atoned." If the Heathen hear not the Gospel, Gospel-faith will not be required from them. Can we suppose the Bible to be God's gift to all, and not sent to all?

The propitiation is an expedient, introduced into the moral government of God, on the ground of which he can save sinners, on what terms he chooses. In what chapter is it visible that the Redeemer died for His people only?

The vainness, and possible vainness, of the atonement, as an objection, has been stabbed, shrouded, coffined, and buried often. We are tired of it.*

Objection VII.—Unconditional Election tallies not with the unrestricted and sincere invitations of the Gospel. It was so expressed by me.

J. H. begins his reply—"This objection may be stated thus—God would not invite or command any person to accept the Gospel, unless that person had power . . to close with the invitation. He has sworn that He has no pleasure in the death of a sinner. That is a part of our creed. He invites the righteous, in the most tender terms, to turn and live; and asks them, 'Why will ye die?' . . . If God knows that the man is unwilling to be saved, . . that he will die, unwilling to be saved in God's appointed way, why does he send his Spirit? If you were infallibly sure that it (the gas-lamp) would not light, would you apply a match in order to light it? You would not. But you might do it for another purpose. . . As it is not for the same purpose that the sun shines and the rains fall upon fields and rocks; so I believe it is with the Spirit's operations, which subdue sin in the hearts of God's people, and produce a different effect on the hearts of unbelievers." (pp. 17, 18.)

On Reply 7, observe:—

1. It "scarcely deserves a reply." He has quite misapprehended me. I contended, that if there was salvation only for some, God could not sincerely invite all to partake of it. But he does. "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth." (Is. xlv., 22.) "And the Spirit and the Bride say come." (Rev. xxii., 17., John vii., 37., Rev. iii., 20.) Are these not unrestricted in their nature? Who will insinuate that they are not? Even Limitarians will not shackle them. Their *length* is to travail in soul, to square them with stinted propitiation. It is unproductive pain. They may impose on the unlearned and simple. The clear-headed detect them, and either commiserate or contemn.

* See the Notes of Barnes, on 2 Cor., v. 14.

Let them beware. Hope that a part can be made equal to the whole! It is worse than madness. No solution of the problem —"How can the Lord entreat the world to accept of mercy, when there is not mercy for the world?"—has been forthcoming; and we predict, no solution will be forthcoming, stretch the future on as it may. It is no marvel that Calvinistic Clergymen are being constantly lip-sealed by the uneducated.

2. J. H. impresses it upon us, that it is an article of their creed that God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked. It staggers me. For it is also an article of their creed, that the "rest of mankind God was *pleased*, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he *pleaseth*, for the glory of his Sovereign Power over his creatures, to pass by and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath, for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice." (Confession, Chap. iii.) How sweetly they coincide!

3. We are plied with the query—If God knows that a man will reject the Gospel, why does the Holy Spirit strive with him in order to his salvation? We turn the querist back a line or so. When God knows that multitudes of the unrighteous will prefer death, why does he invite them, in "the most tender terms, to turn and live?" Why, since the Lawgiver knew that the moral law would be broken, was it promulgated? To crown it, why does he reveal the Gospel to the man whom he foresees will receive it?

One object of the proclamation of the truth to the rejecters of it is, that they may feel their condemnation to be just—that they, and the spectators, at the Judgment, may perceive the righteousness of the punishment to which they are doomed.

Indisputably, J. H. was in the *dark*, when he framed the gas-illustration—"If you were sure it *would* not light." When did it flash upon him that gas-burners had *wills?*

4. Not far from the top of p. 18, J. H. flings us a fragment of his creed. He believes that the Holy Ghost strives to subdue sin in the hearts of God's people, but to produce a *different effect* upon the hearts of unbelievers. "Really, this is too bad." Upon what portion of Scripture does he found the above fragment?

Objection VIII.—Unconditional Election impeaches God's will that all should be saved. Listen to J. H.'s answer—"The Lecturer is endeavouring to ascertain what the will of God is, and, therefore, he has no right to assume it. . . . . Theologians distinguish the will of God into revealed and secret. The revealed will is our duty; the secret, God's purpose. Many things in Scripture would be inexplicable, without this distinction. Take the case of Abraham, when he was commanded to offer up Isaac—the command was God's revealed will, and the Patriarch's duty. But God did not intend that He should offer him up; this was His secret will (p. 18).

On Reply 8, observe:—

I am in excellent company when I "assume" that God will have all to be saved. "Who will have *all men* to be saved?" (Paul). "Not willing that *any* should perish" (Peter). "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, . . . and ye *would not*" (Jesus). Is it not "established beyond dispute?" Can our Calvinistic brethren cull three as reliable supporters from the "unerring standard," that God does *not will* all men to be saved?

J. H.'s "few remarks" on the Divine will are not profound. The point at issue is—"Has God a secret will in opposition to a revealed will?" If so, which is right?

The offering up of Isaac is plausible, but it is not an example of "double-will." The circumstances of Abraham, prior to the binding of his son upon the altar, and the circumstances of Abraham, when he had bound his son, were very different. What, then, is there to puzzle us in the two injunctions—1st, "offer up your son;" 2dly, "offer not up your son." It is God's will that the unbeliever should die. The moment he believes, it is His will that he should *not die*. Do these wills jar? Emphatically no. Besides, the end contemplated was the trial of the Patriarch's faith. In order to this, he must be enjoined to sacrifice the "lad;" and might not God enjoin it, without willing the death of Isaac *per se?*

Objection IX.—If Unconditional Election be true, Ministers cannot carry out the commission to preach the Gospel to every creature.

Mr. H. says—"Since the good are mixed up with the bad, the chaff with the wheat, an indiscriminate or irrespective call is the only thing possible. Ministers do not know the hearts of men. They have discharged their duty when they have proclaimed, in the name of their Master, 'whosoever will, let him come and take of the Water of Life freely.' . . If a man say, he can refuse obedience to the Omnipotent Spirit, it just shews his presumption. . . Perhaps it will be said, God will not save a man against his will—man must be willing. Quite true. But something must make him willing—'No man can come unto me except the Father draw him.' 'Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power.'

"The Lord commanded Moses to go to Pharaoh, and demand the deliverance of the Children of Israel. At the very same time, he told him that he would harden Pharaoh's heart, that he would not let the people go. Now, according to the reasoning of Mr. Cron, in the objection under consideration, Moses might have said to the Lord, 'I cannot effect the object of my commission, seeing that thou hast indurated the heart of the King, in order to prevent the deliverance of the Israelites.' But Moses obeyed. . . . God could, at any time, by his Spirit,

convert the whole inhabitants of the earth, without a single exception, and, at the same time, do no violence to His eternal and immutable decree of Election. Because whole successive or intermediate generations may, for anything to the contrary, be the elect of God. This consideration in itself warrants and encourages Ministers to hold out salvation in Jesus, with the greatest possible confidence, to every soul they address. . . . Do Calvinistic Ministers not preach the Gospel to every creature within their reach? 'Yes; they do.'" (pp. 19, 20.)

On Reply 9, observe:—

1. The Gospel to "every creature," is that for "every creature," a Saviour was born—that for the sins of "every creature" Christ has died. (See Luke ii., 11, and 1 Cor. xv., 1—4.) Can, then, genuine, consistent, Calvinistic Ministers preach the Gospel to "every creature?" It is self-answering. How many thousands of falsehoods they must have told since the Fall! The thought is enough to "freeze the marrow in our bones." "Did Christ die for me," the cry of the awakened soul, causes them to tremble in their shoes. For their response is usually *uncertain*, and must be, if they do not summon the moral courage to cast their dogma of limited atonement to the four winds. We sympathise with the upright Calvinistic Ambassador of Jesus. His situation is not to be envied. He is fettered from the "crown of the head to the sole of the foot—there is no *soundness* in him;" and, if he has any love for precious immortal souls, tormented.

Their doctrines are a brazen wall between their minds and "Be instant in season and out of season." If they shun "inglorious ease," they are forced to have recourse to the "outward call"—"Whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely." But is not the invitation God's, as well as the Minister's? Are they not to invite in the "name of their Master?" Yes. Well, how is it that He addresses the chaff and the wheat indiscriminately? He cannot plead ignorance of the Elect and the Non-Elect. Let Limitarians brood over this aspect of it. It has been, and is pertinaciously blinked.

2. Obedience may be refused to the "Omnipotent Spirit" (Prov., i., 24-25.) "Because I have called, and ye *refused*," &c. Have we "not turned every one to his own way?" We cannot resist Omnipotence, but we can resist the Omnipotent Spirit, when he uses "moral suasion." "Ye stiff-necked . . . ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye" (Acts, vii., 51). Was the proto-martyr presumptuous?

3. Contrast "God will not save a man against His will" and "something must make him willing." Before "something" can "make willing," it must first *will* to *make willing!*

4. The Father is teaching, *i. e.*, drawing every man, and, therefore, every man can come. "And they shall be all taught of God. Every man, therefore, that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me" (John, vi., 45). "Thy

people shall be willing in the day of Thy power." The prediction was fulfilled at Pentecost, and is fulfilling*

5. Did the "I am that I am" command his servant Moses to go to Pharaoh, and deliver a message, without furnishing the message? "There's the rub."

6. Place alongside of—"God could, *at any time*, by his Spirit, convert the whole inhabitants of the earth, without a single exception; and, at the same time, do no violence to the eternal and immutable decree of Election." "Because whole succession or intermediate generations *may*, for anything to the contrary, be the Elect of God." Could God have done it up to this date? Expunge the "at any time."

The consideration, that a generation may be the Elect of God, warrants and encourages Ministers to "hold out salvation in Jesus, with the greatest possible confidence, to every soul they address." "With confidence!" "With the greatest confidence!" when it is extremely probable that for the *majority* there is no "salvation in Jesus;" and, if so, can it be held out? May not the consideration, that a generation may be the *reprobate* of God, protest and thunder against Ministers, holding out salvation to *any* soul they address?

7. I rejoice that Calvinistic Ministers have preached, and do preach, the Gospel to sinners promiscuously; but it is at the expense of their creed. On these occasions they outrage the Confession; and if that Confession were not wanting in sensibility, it would groan long and loud against its assassins. Hundreds of them, again, I grieve to write it, are, instead of proclaiming the Gospel, fighting meanly, bitterly against it, and persecuting, with the two-edged sword of distance and scowling, many who glory in Christ and Him crucified.

Objection X.—Faith and Repentance cannot be the duty of every man.

Mr. H. having, as he thinks, vitiated the two self-evident principles—(viz., (1.) "The Divine Being never will demand of us what we are unable to perform;" and (2.) "We are under obligation to do only what we can do")—on which I founded my objection, touches not the objection itself. His investigation of them is inexpressibly ludicrous. "Judge ye"—"God said, Let there be Light; and there was light." What was it that God addressed? Darkness brooded over the deep; yet light sparkled in being, "and God saw that it was good." Christ commanded the barren fig-tree to yield no more fruit, "and presently it withered away." The very tree heard, and obeyed. Where was this power? . . . What does God say to us? "Make you a new heart." Who can do it? . . . "Love thy neighbour as thyself," there, is a touch-stone by which any self-righteous Morisonian or Arminian may try himself. .

* See Rev. John Guthrie's Lecture on the "Nature and Extent of the Work of the Holy Spirit," p. 32.

Jesus said to the man at the Pool of Bethesda, "Rise, take up thy bed, and walk." Had the man power to obey? Certainly not. . . .

The second principle does not rest on a better foundation; it is "we are under obligation to do only what we can." I would rather say, that we are under obligation to do what we *ought*. . . . "Can the Ethiopian change his skin?" . . . . We have ability to do evil; but where is our ability to do good? Sin has taken it from us—wilful sin—our own sin. When a person, by extravagance and carelessness, squanders his property, and contracts debts which he is not able to pay, does his inability free him from all obligation to the creditors? Not at all (pp. 21, 22.)

On Reply 10, observe:—

1. I did not say, God would not command "darkness" to emit "light." I did not say, that Christ would not command "the *barren fig-tree* to yield no *more fruit*." I did not say He would not command "ferocious beasts" to "restrain their carnivorous propensities," and "blazing flames" to "restrain their devouring fury;" but I did say, that He would not command *men* to do what they were unable to perform. Is it not an axiom in moral science, as unquestionable as any mathematical axiom? What absurdity, insincerity, injustice, cruelty, in a command to do what cannot be done by us, and enforced by a tremendous sanction! "Make you a new heart," is specified. The Gospel can effect that, and we can believe it. "Love your enemies." I hope J. H. does not hate his. "Love the Lord with all your mind." Note the "your." "Love thy neighbour as thyself." Did not the Apostles? did not Luther, Melancthon,* and a multitude of the Reformers and martyrs? Did not John Howard, &c.?

> "Yes, man for man, perchance, may brave
> The horrors of the yawning grave."

The man, with the infirmity of thirty-eight years, at the pool of Bethesda, had the power to obey. "And, immediately, the man was made whole, and took up his bed and walked, (John v., 9). The communication of the strength was simultaneous with the order.

2. The second principle which J. H. faults is, that "we are under obligation to do only what we can." A star "under obligation" to lecture on astronomy! A whale "under obligation" to startle the world by a treatise on navigation! Hark, the truism. "We are under obligation to do what we ought," that is, "we are under obligation to do what we are under obligation to do," or nonsense is nonsense. Would there be "greatness of iniquity" in the Ethiopian not changing his skin, or the leopard his spots? Do our Magistrates, as was lately

* The "gentle" Melancthon, when thinking of the confinement of the "intrepid" Luther in the Wartburg, exclaimed,—"Would to God I were able, at the cost of my miserable life, to detain in the world one who is its brightest ornament." (His. of the Reformation, vol. III.)

asked, but not answered, believe that it is absolutely impossible for "those accustomed to do evil" to do good. Ponder (Jeremiah, xiii., 22). "We have ability to do evil, but where is our ability to do good?" The one implies the other—"Doing good, with the power and possibility of doing evil; doing evil, with the power and possibility of doing good. This is the conception, and this alone, on which we can base, praise and blame, reward and punishment."*

3. When a person, by extravagance, contracts debts which he cannot possibly pay, it is a result for which he is responsible. Our judgment is, that he deserves to be punished, because he might not, and should not, have been extravagant. If he was the free cause of the inability, and he really cannot, he is accountable; but it would be ridiculous to command him to accomplish that which he cannot accomplish, and highly improper to speak of him as "under obligation" to accomplish it. He ought not to have squandered his property, and if, in the providence of God, and by his exertions, he can redeem himself, it is obligatory: failing that, reparation must be obtained in some form.

Objection XI.—If Unconditional Election be true, sinners cannot be condemned for their want of faith. Our pamphleteer struggles in the net—"It will not hold, that because a man cannot believe, there is no unbelief, any more than it would follow that, because a man cannot learn, there is no ignorance. . . We have deprived ourselves by sin of the power to do anything good or pleasing to God. But that does not exempt us from obligation. . . If a man had cut off his hand to avoid working, he deserves a double punishment. 1st—For not working; 2d—For disabling himself for future labour. . . The objection overlooks a distinction in Christian philosophy, of which no Minister can be ignorant—I mean the distinction between *natural and moral* inability, which, when observed, completely removes the 10th and 11th objections." (P. 23.)

On Reply 11, observe:—

1. Sinners are condemned for their want of faith—Heb. x. 29. "Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the Covenant wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the spirit of grace."—John iii. 19. "And this is the condemnation, that light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light—because their deeds were evil."—2 Thess. ii. 12.

2. As there can be no faith without a testimony, the sinner, for whom there is no Gospel, cannot be condemned for not believing; belief in what does not exist, being impossible. If he were condemned for not receiving Christ, when there was no Christ to receive, it would be condemnation for not crediting a lie!

* Tappan's "Moral Agency," p. 16.

3. J. H. depones—"It will not hold, that because a man cannot believe, there is no unbelief, any more than it would follow that because a man cannot learn, there is no ignorance." But it will hold "that because a man cannot believe, there is no unbelief" (with him), and it will follow "that because a man cannot learn, there is no ignorance" (with him). Others having the power, may not believe. Others capable of learning, may be ignorant. He who cannot believe cannot be an unbeliever. He who cannot learn cannot be ignorant. Does the author of the Refutation ever look up, and reprimand the "glorious orb" for its unbelief? Does he, gazing on—

"Old Ocean's gray and melancholy waste."

ever ejaculate, "Thou ignorant sea!" We trow not. Why? Because the sun cannot believe, and the "world of waters" cannot learn the first letter of the alphabet.

4. The individual, who has deliberately incapacitated himself for labour, can neither be condemned nor punished for not working. He cannot feel under obligation to work, and he cannot be guilty of actual sluggishness. He can be condemned and punished, only because his unfitness for manual toil is a consequence of a foregoing wicked act.

5. "The so-called *natural ability* is entirely subject to the so-called *moral ability*. It is just as true that there cannot be a volition without the moral ability, the theory itself being judge, as that there cannot be a stated sequent of a volition, unless their first be the volition on which it depends. How are we to expect the movement of the mill-stone, by the revolution of the water-wheel, when there is no water-power. And how are we to expect the sequent of a volition, when there is no motive adequate to produce the volition! If, then, a sequent of a volition be required by the law of conscience (e.g.), the lifting of an infirm and helpless being out of a ditch, and yet there be no motive present strong enough to produce the volition, it is evident that my natural ability is of no avail. I have no power to do, and, therefore, it is nonsensical to affirm that I ought to lift him out of the ditch; and no less so, when I do not lift him out, to affirm that I am blameworthy, and deserve to be punished."*

Objection XII.—Unconditional Election subverts the grace of Justification.

This objection annoys J. H. considerably. He battles against it with all his might. He might as well essay to "remove mountains." I am on a "rock," and he cannot prevail against me. His assault is more noisy than deadly, as the following quotations will convince you:—

"It requires all the hardihood a Morisonian can command, to prefer this charge. It is most surprising how any one could make it. For the terms being understood, the language evidently implies the doctrine of Justification by Grace. If God

* Tappan's "Moral Agency," p. 19.

decreed to elect and justify his people freely, unconditionally—how can it be an act of justice, and not of mercy? To be an act of justice it must be *conditional;* and this is the essence of Morisonianism. . . . The Morisonian system teaches that God is *necessitated* to pardon and accept every one, who supplies the condition; and that, when he does supply the condition, God is bound to save him. . . . In Mr. Cron's objection, it (necessity) is used in its common sense (as implying 'opposition to will'); whereas it must be understood in its psychological application (as expressing the 'connexion between certain co-relative antecedents and consequents'). . . . When He recorded the decree of salvation in Heaven, He did it freely, and He applies these means of salvation in time, as freely as he made provision for them in eternity. So that His word, His promise, His oath to save His people, instead of laying Him under any necessity, are so many infallible assurances that salvation is indubitably certain. An illustration may make the thought clearer. A benevolent man promises a donation to a charitable institution, and gives the donation just as freely as he promised it. His promise, instead of necessitating him to fulfil it, is merely a guarantee or evidence that his bounty is sure. . . . He says, that if Unconditional Election be true, prayer and other means of grace are unnecessary." (pp. 24, 25.)

On Reply 12, observe:—

1. The theory of atonement, embosomed in Election, does subvert the grace of justification. What is that theory? J. H. divulges it (p. 16)—"God is just, and will not exact a second penalty." And (p. 22)—"We have much reason to rejoice that Christ has paid it (the debt of sin) for us." The Elect were in debt to God! Their surety discharged it for them; so that it would not be "just" in God to "exact a second penalty." God is under necessity, as a righteous Being, to justify them. Grace has nothing to do with it. He is morally bound to cancel their crimes; and were he refusing, there would be a stain upon His character. If a benefactor purchased a book for me, to be forwarded immediately, would the transmission of it be a gracious act on the part of the bookseller? The Election may be of grace. The justification cannot—it is a piece of fair dealing.

2. The justification of the Elect is not unconditional, as J. H. insinuates. It is "received by faith alone" (Q. 70, Larger Catechism). Justification takes place when the Elect believe, and not before it. "Wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ; are effectually called *unto faith* in Christ, by his Spirit working in due season; are *justified*, adopted, sanctified, and kept by His power, through faith, unto salvation." (Confession, chap. iii.)

3. J. H. will have it that I used "necessity" (which is not in my statement of Objection 12) in the "vulgar sense." I used

it (in my reasonings, under Objection 12) neither in the "vulgar" nor in the "psychological" sense. By necessity was meant, necessity to do *what was right.*

4. The promise of God, which is, and should be, respected, to justify believers, does not annihilate the grace of justification; for he was at liberty not to promise. The promise was from *choice;* and, therefore, the free fulfilment of it is gracious. The character of the act is changed, when the necessity springs out of a *work done by another* for the Elect. Mr. H. is forgetful that there is a "third party," viz., Jesus. There is the Father, the Saviour, and the sinner. Christ, by excruciating agonies, in the day of his humiliation, responded literally to the claims of God upon the Elect; and, in view of his death, God *must* set them free; so that grace is excluded—utterly excluded. Were the Father not acquitting them, it would be an *injury* to them. True, all donations, promised or not promised, to charitable institutions, are of grace. But, suppose that the withholdment of the money, on account of the conduct of another, for the institution, would be *wrong*, and would the money be a donation—above all, a donation of grace? I repeat, the necessity to justify the Elect does not arise out of a Divine decree, passed in eternity, but out of the atonement of the Lamb—the second person of the adorable Trinity.

5. I did not proclaim "prayer and other means of grace unnecessary." I proclaimed prayer for pardon unnecessary, if Unconditional Election were true. Fancy a poor creature petitioning the creditor to remit that for which he has been fully satisfied by a generous friend. Is it not a blunder?*

Objection XIII.—Unconditional Election cannot be true, for saints may fall away, and be lost. Our antagonist, instead of improving towards the close of his pamphlet, exhibits symptoms of deterioration. He composes and argues, like an *intellectual invalid.* He does not grapple at all with Objection 13. The section refutes itself. Among his feeble utterances are these:—"The Bible does not furnish a single instance of a saint having been finally lost. The case of Judas will not establish this doctrine. . . . The passages of Scripture which seem to imply that God's people may be lost, admit of easy and satisfactory explanation. God saves his people by rational means—means which correspond to the constitution of the nature He has given them. . . . They are to 'watch and pray,' and 'beware,' and 'be stedfast.' 'They are to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling,' 'lest they be castaways.' These are the very means which Infinite Wisdom hath adopted to prevent the total and final apostacy of his people. May not their names be blotted out of the Book of Life? Are they not

* Dr. Wardlaw repudiated the scheme of "exact equivalent," because it excluded "everything of the nature of grace from every part of the process of the sinner's salvation, excepting the original appointment of the surety, whose payment, in each case, of the estimated debt, cancels the bond, and renders the liberation of the debtor not gracious, but obligatory."—"Atonement of Christ," p. 65.

cautioned to fear that awful consequence? Yes; but it is the best way to secure their stedfastness in the faith of Christ, and cement their union with Christ. Paul says—'Though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached, let him be accursed' (Gal., i., 8). Now, I ask any unprejudiced reader, was there a possibility of an angel coming from Heaven, and preaching another Gospel? There is just the same reason for inferring it, that there is to infer that Paul might be a 'castaway.' Take another parallel. Christ prays—'If it be possible, let the cup pass from me.' . . Was it possible that the cup could pass from him? . . . . 'The path of the just is as the shining light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day.' 'Though a good man fall, he shall not be utterly cast down; for the Lord upholdeth him with his hands.' 'A just man falleth seven times, and riseth again.' 'I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish; neither shall any pluck them out of my hand.' How apt and beautiful the story of the lost sheep. It strays from the fold, but the good shepherd follows it through all its wanderings until he finds it; and he brings it back rejoicing. Not less interesting is the tale of the prodigal son. . . . Is such a doctrine calculated to make men careless? What! such exhibitions of love as these make men negligent of duty?" (pp. 25-26.)

On Reply 13, observe—

1. The writer of it has *strange* notions of a Revelation, if he expects it to furnish him with the names of those who have perished. It does not undertake to provide us with the list of the lost, and their histories on earth. If the doctrine of the falling away of the Saints is introduced, it will be in the shape of exhortations, warnings, threatenings; and in this shape it is introduced. See Gal. v. 1, Col. i. 23, Heb. vi. 4, 5, 6; Gal. i. 6, 2 Peter iii. 17, 2 John i. 8. Abstaining from speculation about Judas, J. H. might derive advantage from the study of 1 Tim. i. 19 and 20—"Holding faith and a good conscience, which some, having put away, concerning faith have made shipwreck," "of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander," &c. Heb. x. 39—"But we are not of those who draw back into perdition," &c.

2. We are told, "God saves his people by rational means"—that is, He counsels them to "beware" when there is no danger!—to "be stedfast," when they *cannot but* "be stedfast!"—to "work out their own salvation with fear and trembling," "lest they be castaways," when there is no *fear* of final apostacy! This is argumentation in earnest. Stopping not, he impeaches the Divine character. To caution those whose names cannot be blotted out, "to fear that awful consequence" is the "best way" to "cement their union to Christ!" Was he unmindful that in everything God is *straightforward?* Was he unmindful that the union is ratified by an immutable decree?

With Gal. i. 8 before him—"Though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you," &c.—J. H. dares "any unprejudiced reader" to affirm the possibility of an angel coming from Heaven, and preaching another Gospel. I am at one with Barnes on it—"This is a very strong rhetorical mode of expression. It is not to be supposed that an angel from Heaven would preach any other than the true Gospel. But Paul wishes to put the *strongest possible case in the strongest possible manner*, that the true Gospel had been preached to them." If every passage in which "though" occurs is to be similarly explained, we are suspicious that the Bible will suffer greatly. Psalm xxxvii. 24—"Though a good man fall, he shall not be utterly cast down"—that is, "It is not to be supposed that a good man will fall!" If J. H. interprets Christ's prayer, "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me," as a *denial of the possibility* of the cup passing from Him, he nullifies it. It is *no* prayer. I again, with pleasure, quote from Barnes—"If it be possible—that is, if the world can be redeemed; if it be consistent with justice, and maintaining the government of the universe—that man should be saved without this extremity of sorrow, let it be done." *

"The path of the *just*," &c. Amen. "A *just* man falleth," &c. Amen. "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish; neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." Who are the "them?" Believers (as is obvious from John iii. 36—"He that believeth in the Son hath everlasting life"). Well, can any believer perish, or be plucked out of Christ's hands? No; but they may depart from the living God by discontinuing faith. The story of the lost sheep is apt and beautiful. As the shepherd is averse to the perishing of the sheep, so is "our Father in Heaven" averse to the perishing of *any* who have wandered from his fold. The death of one sheep is against the nature of Him who delighteth in mercy. How then could He remorselessly destine myriads of immortal intelligences to the endurance of anguish unutterable? The God of Calvinism is not the God of the Old and New Testament; for the God of Scripture welcomes the return of every prodigal. He is not to blame if every prodigal human sinner does not return, constrained by His love, and wooed by the forbearing Spirit.

The idea, "once in grace, always in grace," is eminently calculated to make the converted careless; and that is why we are anxious to eradicate it. Let it be boldly preached from the pulpit, and speedily will the "peaceable fruits of righteousness" wither and disappear.

That Saints may not persevere, I appeal to the 15th chapter of John's Gospel. The passages adduced by J. H., to demonstrate they cannot, are meagre and unsatisfactory. 1 Cor. ix., 27, will sweep away all he can pile up of the same description, though he should contest the palm with Methuselah.

* Matthew, xxvi., 39. Matthew, xiii., 32.

Objection XIV. is not as Mr. H. has it, "If Unconditional Election be true, the efforts of Satan cannot but be successful," but, "If Unconditional be true, the efforts of Satan and his emissaries to ruin souls, cannot but be *unsuccessful*." Its perversion is to me a mystery.

J. H. parades it as a truth, that Satan never has been "successful." Ought he not to bow to *stubborn facts?* Satan opposed the Divine will. That is a *fact.* Satan seduced our first parents. That is a *fact.* He cannot triumph over Omnipotence. God will pay him the "wages" he earns in the practice of evil. His wicked works will be over-ruled to God's glory and the weal of the vast universe. Of this we are fully persuaded, but, while we are, we see not what benefit can accrue from the flat negation, that the Devil has been to no extent successful. On the supposition, that salvation, through Christ, has been brought within the reach of every sinner, the head of the serpent has been effectually *bruised*, though many may, by the rejection of the boon, sink into hell. On the supposition, that salvation has been brought within the reach of the elect alone, the head of the "serpent" has neither been bruised, nor half bruised.

His victory is almost complete, and, therefore, we cannot smile on Unconditional Election. That the reader may know my *mode* of presenting the objections, at the refutation of which J. H. has aimed, I take the liberty of transcribing my remarks under the Fourteenth:—We hold, in common, that there is a Devil—that it is his main business to lead sinners to that place where there is "weeping and wailing." His operations are, in great measure, inscrutable; but that he "goeth about like a roaring lion" is unequivocally taught in revelation. He has no constraining power over any creature. His "fiery darts" may be quenched. Behind the "shield of faith" we have nothing to fear. If we resist, he will, humbled and disappointed, betake himself to flight. He is the antagonist of the spirit—sympathises not with the spirit in his desires; and would fain thwart the means employed to reconcile and regenerate the unholy.

That this degraded being (for he was once at the top of the scale of intelligence, honour, and happiness) has done mankind no mischief, who is prepared to allow? He is free of the *harmlessness* of the Lamb.

The religious community have been in the habit of representing him as a burning curse—the oldest and deadliest of malefactors—as contributing largely to the filling of his abominable den. The assertion would confound us, that his endeavours, from the beginning until now, have been abortive—have not secured the condemnation of one more spirit, than would have been condemned at any rate—that his works have been, without exception, *useless ciphers.* We cannot well lodge the thought, that he has been labouring, ignorant all the while that his labours must be in vain; or, if not ignorant, that he would ply his machinery as he has been plying it. I say, we cannot well

lodge the thought, that the number of the lost would have been the *same*, even though he had not tempted a solitary mind with a solitary bait. It is our conviction, that the race is incalculably the worse of his existence; and that had he not lived, schemed, and executed, the state of things in eternity might have been different. But if Unconditional Election is not a fragment of the imagination, we must infer, he has had no *influence on the issues of moral conflicts.*

We must acknowledge, that, so far as consequences are concerned, he might as well have been *idle*. Chaining him for a thousand years a blessing! He has always been chained, at a respectable distance, from the Elect. In helplessness, may he look and gnash his teeth; he cannot lay his hand upon "less than the least" of them. The favoured body have marched through the wilderness with a "wall of fire" encompassing them, high and gapless, and the "adversary" has prowled round, in the pangs of starvation, and prowled to no purpose.

Has he, at any period, overlept it? Has he broken through, to the detriment of a single sheep? No. There will be found at the judgment, on the right, all God intended to be there—all that *could* be there; and, on the left, all God intended to be there. The two classes will assemble in their entireness; and the Devil will not be able to point to one, aided or hindered by him or any other agent.

I have thus finished my critique of J. H.'s pamphlet. I have felt that I have been combating error, which it is of the last importance to crush. I have felt that I have been feebly guarding the character of the incomparable and incomprehensible Jehovah. I have felt that I have been lifting up an arm in truth's defence; and, if it turn out that I have been engaged in her service, it will be a solid gratification. Let the reader decide which of us is of the *Scripture Scriptural.* He is responsible for the exercise of his own judgment, as we are for ours. If the sentiments of J. H. are in harmony with the Book of Books, they merit a warm reception. If my sentiments are in harmony with the Book of Books, embrace them, retain them, spread them—pray for their propagation. The substance of what I have hastily written is this:—There is no frowning decree of Reprobation between any rebel and salvation. The gates of the sunless, moonless, glory-lighted City are *wide for all;* and none who approach it, identified with Jesus by faith, will be under the necessity of crying "Lord! open, open!" *They are impassable to the suicidal unbeliever alone.*

I would recommend the perusal of "Bible Election," by the Rev. F. Ferguson, Glasgow; "The Nature and Extent of the Work of the Holy Spirit," by the Rev. J. Guthrie; "The Cloud Dispelled," by the Rev. J. Kirk, Edinburgh.

APPENDIX.

A BRIEF STATEMENT

OF THE

DOCTRINES AND CONSTITUTION

OF THE

Independent "Evangelical Union" Church,

BELFAST.

I.—DOCTRINES.

1.

THAT the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were given by inspiration of God: that they contain all things that pertain to spiritual life and godliness; and that they are the only authoritative standard of Christian faith and practice.

2 Tim. iii. 16.

2.

That there is one God, existing in three distinct personalities—coequal in perfection; and that this three-one-God is an absolute Sovereign, exercising His sovereignty in infinite wisdom and love.

Deut. vi. 4; Matt. xxviii. 19; Rom. ix. 15, 18.

3.

That by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passes upon all men, for that all sinned (in him); and that all who have actually sinned, are so guilty and so depraved, that were it not for the remedial scheme, wrought out by the Divine Saviour, and applied by the Divine Spirit, they would be hopelessly lost. All infants dying in infancy we regard as heirs of salvation.

Rom. v. 12; Rom. iii. 9-21; Luke xviii. 16.

4.

That the Divine Father loves the whole world of sinful men, and is not willing that any should perish, but that all should turn unto him and live.

John iii. 16; 1 Tim. ii. 3, 4; 2 Peter iii. 9.

5.

That the Divine Saviour tasted death for every man, and made a complete propitiation for the sins of the whole world,—which propitiation is the only meritorious cause of human salvation.

1 Tim. ii. 6; 1 John ii. 1, 2; Isaiah xxviii. 16.

6.

That the love and work of the Divine Spirit are coextensive with the love of the Divine Father, and the work of the Divine Saviour; that it is by this agency that any sinner is converted, and that every believer is sanctified; but that his influence may be resisted by sinners, and quenched by believers.

Acts ii. 17; Acts vii. 51; 1 Thess. v. 19.

7.

That faith in Christ,—which faith is the reception of the testimony of God concerning his son, and necessarily involves in itself repentance,—is the immeritorious condition of salvation, and invariably leads to peace with God, joy in the Holy Ghost, and purity of heart and life.

Acts xvi. 31 ; 1 John v. 9 ; Mark i. 15 ; Acts xvii. 30 ; Rom. v. 1, &c. ; Acts xv. 9.

8.

That, while God hath not foreordained whatsoever comes to pass, he hath foreordained whatever He himself brings to pass ; and that from before the foundation of the world he hath purposed to elect to salvation those who in time believe in Jesus.

Jer. vii. 9, 10, 29-31 ; Eph. i. 4 ; 2 Thess. ii. 13 ; 1 Peter i. 1, 2.

II.—CONSTITUTION.

1.

THAT the Church is composed of those who profess to have peace with God through the Lord Jesus Christ, and who give evidence, by their walk and conversation, that they have passed from death unto life.

1 Cor. i. 2 ; Eph. i. 1, &c.

2.

That the Church, in its external relations, is Independent. It manages all its own affairs ; elects its own Office-bearers, and, if need be, calls on them to resign, without any interference from other Churches.

1 Cor. v. 3-13, &c.

3.

That the Church, in its internal relations, is Presbyterian. It has a plurality of elders, who are also called in the New Testament "Bishops" and "Pastors." The spiritual oversight of the Church is vested in the Elders, who give special attention to cases of admission and of discipline, and to all that affects the spiritual interests of the Church.

Acts xiv. 23; Acts xx. 28 ; Heb. xiii. 17.

4.

That the temporal affairs of the Church are entrusted to the management of Deacons, who statedly report their proceedings to the Church. The Elders are *ex officio* Members of the Deacon's meeting.

Acts vii. 3 ; Phil. i. 1.

5.

That the Funds necessary to sustain Divine Ordinances in the Church, and to diffuse the gospel of salvation in the world, are derived from the voluntary contributions of the Members, and of such others as may feel interested.

1 Cor. xvi. 2 ; 1 Cor. ix. 14 ; Gal. vi. 6.

Printed at "The Northern Whig" Office.